

VOLUME 4. Parts 16/18
pp. 447—542.

COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF
PARASITOLOGY, 1948-1950.
WINCHESTER,
395, HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

9th June, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

23 JUN 1950

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

<i>The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 :</i>	Page
Conclusions of Fourteenth Meeting (second instalment)	447—542

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(All rights reserved)

(For the rule under which a trivial name such as "4-maculatus" is to be transliterated as "quattuor-maculatus," see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 10)

- (b) to set aside the selection by Latreille (1810) of "*Carabus 4-maculatus* Fab." (= *Carabus quattuor-maculatus* Linnaeus, 1758) as the type species of the genus *Lebia* Latreille [1802–1803], and to designate in the place of that species *Buprestis marginatus* Fourcroy, 1785, to be the type species of the foregoing genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 251–252; Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *ibid.*, 1: 252–253);
- (c) to set aside the selection by Westwood (1838) of *Bembidium obtusum* Sturm, 1825, as the type species of the genus *Tachys* Stephens, 1828, and to designate in the place of that species *Tachys scutellaris* Stephens, 1828, to be the type species of the foregoing genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 253; Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *ibid.*, 1: 254);
- (d) to set aside the selection by Latreille (1810) of "*Trechus meridianus* Clairv." (= *Carabus meridianus* Linnaeus, 1761) as the type species of the genus *Trechus* Schellenberg, 1806, and to designate in the place of that species *Carabus quadristriatus* Schrank, 1781, to be the type species of the foregoing genus (Andrewes, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 255; Marshall, Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair & Cameron, 1947, *ibid.*, 1: 256).

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion 10)

In discussion the view was expressed that it was desirable to seek additional information in regard to these applications in the same way as had been agreed upon in the case of the name *Bradyellus* Erichson, 1837, which the Commission had considered a few minutes earlier.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

- (1) that the information in their possession on the question whether the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the undermentioned names of genera in the Order Coleoptera (Class Insecta) would lead to greater confusion than uniformity was not sufficient to show whether in these cases the plenary powers should be used in the manner proposed:—

Harpalus Latreille [1802–1803] and *Ophonus* Stephens, 1827

Lebia Latreille [1802–1803]

Tachys Stephens, 1828

Trechus Schellenberg, 1806;

- (2) to notify the foregoing conclusion to the Royal Entomological Society of London (through which the foregoing applications had been submitted to the Commission) and at the same time to ask for supplementary statements setting out, for each of the names concerned, the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended by the Society if the *Règles* were strictly applied in relation to the names specified in (1) above;
- (3) to defer taking decisions on the applications referred to above, until the supplementary statements, asked for in (2) above, were severally available.

**Part 11 of Volume 1
of the "Bulletin of
Zoological
Nomenclature":
applications
published in, to
be considered in
turn**

*(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
13th Meeting,
Conclusion 15)*

**"Dinornis novae-
zealandiae" Owen,
1842 (Class Aves,
Order Dinornithi-
formes): deter-
mination of
lectotype of, under
Article 31**

13. THE COMMISSION had before them Part 11 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing 21 papers relating to 18 individual problems of nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION:—

- (1) took note that two of the papers published in Part 11 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (i.e. the papers relating to the generic name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762) had already been considered at the meeting noted in the margin when the Commission had examined the question of the availability of generic names published in Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abrég. Ins. Env. Paris*;
- (2) agreed to examine, in turn, each of the remaining 17 applications, 19 papers relating to which had been published in the foregoing Part of the *Bulletin*.

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)136) submitted by Dr. Gilbert Archey (Auckland Institute and Museum, New Zealand) and Dr. R. S. Allan (Canterbury University College, Christchurch, New Zealand) asking for a ruling on the identity of the type species of the nominal species *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843 (Class Aves, Order Dinornithiformes), having regard to the fact that Owen did not designate a type specimen for this species and that of his three syntypes, one, the tarso-metatarsus (m3), had later (1844) been designated by Owen as the holotype of *Dinornis struthoides* while another, the tibio-tarsus (t2), had at the same time been designated as the holotype of another new nominal species, *Dinornis ingens* Owen (Archey & Allan, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1 : 257). The applicants

had made it clear (*in litt.*) that in their view two species only were involved and had added that no confusion would arise either if the Commission were to rule that the lectotype of *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843, was the specimen which later had been designated as the holotype of *Dinornis ingens* Owen, 1844, or if they were to rule that it was the specimen (the femur (f12)), which alone of the original syntypes of *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843, had not later been designated as the holotype of another nominal species. The applicants agreed that if the Commission were to take the latter view the trivial name *novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843, would replace the trivial name *struthoides* Owen, 1844, since, in their view, the femus (which would then be the lectotype of *novaezealandiae* Owen) was referable to the same species as the tarso-metatarsus, which was the holotype of *struthoides* Owen, 1844.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that while, prior to the opening of the present Session, it might have been difficult to answer the question raised by this case, all difficulty had been removed by the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin that Article 31 (applying to type specimens of species the provisions of Article 30 in regard to the type species of genera) should be clarified and amplified. That decision had made it clear, *inter alia*, that the provisions of *Opinion 62* (now, as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, to be incorporated in the *Règles*) (that an author, acting under Rule (g) in Article 30, could, if he so desired, select as the type species of a genus a species which was already the type species of another genus) applied also in the field of type specimens, that is to say, an author was free, should he so desire, to select as the lectotype of one nominal species a specimen which was already the holotype or lectotype of another. It was clear therefore that the first selection of a lectotype for the species originally described as *Dinornis novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843 (namely the selection by Lydekker (1891) from the three syntypes of that species the tibio-tarsus (t2) to be the lectotype of the above species) was valid under the *Règles*. In consequence, the trivial name *ingens* Owen, 1844, was an objective synonym of *novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843, the same specimen being the lectotype of the species bearing the older of these names and the holotype of the species bearing the later published of the names in question.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

- (1) that Lydekker (1891) did not act in contravention of Article 31 when he selected from among the three syntypes of the nominal species *Dinornis*

(For the decisions that Article 15 should be amended to require that a compound trivial name should be written as a single word and that names published in contravention of that Article should automatically be corrected, see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 9, and 4th Meetng, Conclusion 5, respectively)

novaezealandiae Owen, 1843, the tibio-tarsus (t2) to be the lectotype of that species and consequently the foregoing lectotype selection, being the first to have been made under Article 31, was valid under the *Règles*;

- (2) that, in view of (1) above, the trivial name *ingens* Owen, 1844 (published in the binominal combination *Dinornis ingens*), being the trivial name of a nominal species of which the specimen referred to in (1) above was the holotype, was an objective synonym of the older trivial name *novaezealandiae* Owen, 1843;
- (3) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" :—
novaezealandiae Owen, 1843 (as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis novaezealandiae*), determined in the manner specified in (1) above;
struthoides Owen, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis struthoides*);
- (4) to place the trivial name *ingens* Owen, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Dinornis ingens*), on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";
- (5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

Martin (W.), 1793
 "Fig. Descr. Petrif.
 Derbyshire", and
 1809, "Petrificata
 Derbiensis",
 declared not
 available for
 nomenclatorial
 purposes

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)147), submitted by Dr. J. Brookes Knight (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) asking for a ruling on the question of the availability of names first published in two works by W. Martin: (1) that author's *Figures and Descriptions of Petrifications collected in Derbyshire*, published in 1793; (2) his *Petrificata Derbiensis; or Figures and descriptions of Petrifications collected in Derbyshire*, published in 1809 (Knight, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1 : 260). By way of illustration of the type of nomenclature employed by Martin in these works Dr. Knight had submitted the following examples: (1) "CONCHYLIOLITHUS (catillus) HELICIS" which appeared in Martin's *Fig. Descr. Petrif. Derbyshire* of 1793, as regards which Dr. Knight had stated that it was clear from the discussion given (in English) that Martin did not regard *Conchyliolithus* as a name, looking upon it merely as a designation for fossil shells, for in the above case he

used the expression "a fossil shell, of the genus *Helix*" in connection with the species to which he had applied the trinominal designation quoted above; (2) "*Conchyliolithus Anomites productus*" and "*Conchyliolithus Nautilites Ammonites listeri*," which appeared in Martin's *Petrificata Derbiensis* of 1809.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 3)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that it was impossible to argue that the expressions quoted by Dr. Knight were examples of binomial nomenclature and therefore to claim that in the two works in question Martin had "appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binominale" as was now required by Proviso (b) to Article 25. There was, therefore, in his view, no doubt but that both the foregoing works by Martin should be rejected for nomenclatorial purposes, the new "names" published therein not complying with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25. According to the information submitted by Dr. Knight, a decision in the foregoing sense would do no more than confirm the existing practice of specialists, so far as Martin's so-called "generic names" were concerned, these having been "universally ignored." Dr. Knight had added, however, that later authors had almost universally adopted the so-called "trivial names" employed by Martin in the later of the two works in question, namely the *Petrificata Derbiensis* of 1809. It was not clear whether the rejection of the *Petrificata Derbiensis* of 1809 as unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes would give rise to confusion in the field of trivial names (as well as preventing such confusion in the field of generic names), for where a work had to be rejected in this way, it was commonly found that the next author to use one of the trivial names so rejected (who in such circumstances became for nomenclatorial purposes the author of the name) had used the name in the same sense as the author whose use of the name had been rejected. Normally, in such circumstances the name continued to be the name for the species to which it had been originally applied, although now attributed to a later author and ranking for purposes of priority from a later date. Only when the name in its new priority was antedated by some other name published in the meantime by some other author or when, through the action of another author, the name had become a homonym, would a name, when so republished by a later author, cease to be the available name for the species in question. It was to be hoped that examination of the literature would show that the majority of the trivial names in question were still the oldest available names for the species to which they had been applied by

Martin, even if they had now to be attributed to different authors and to later dates. In so far as this was not the case, it would still be open to specialists to apply to the Commission for the validation of any given trivial name as from its use by Martin in 1809, if they were satisfied that otherwise confusion would ensue. The Acting President added that the present case had been advertised as a case in which it might be desired to use the plenary powers of the Commission, but, for the reasons which he had explained, there was, in his opinion, no reason for the adoption of such a course.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) that in the undermentioned works Martin (W.) did not apply the "principes de la nomenclature binominale" as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25 and that therefore no name, whether an apparent generic name or an apparent trivial name, published in either of these works possessed any availability under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published :—
 - (a) Martin, 1793, *Figures and Descriptions of Petrifications collected in Derbyshire*;
 - (b) Martin, 1809, *Petrificata Derbyiensia: or Figures and Descriptions of Petrifications collected in Derbyshire*;
- (2) to give sympathetic consideration to any application which might be submitted by interested specialists for the validation as from Martin, 1809, of any trivial name first published by that author in his *Petrificata derbyiensia* where that name was in general use for a common species and it could be shown that under (1) above it would be necessary to change the name of that species and that such change would lead to confusion in nomenclature ;
- (3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Twelve generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) published in 1807 by Fabricius and Illiger in different senses : suppression under the plenary powers of the names so published by Illiger

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)148) submitted by Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom), in regard to the relative priority to be assigned to certain generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) which had been published in 1807 independently by Fabricius and Illiger respectively, by whom they had been applied in very different senses (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1 : 261-269).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application, which had been submitted by himself as a specialist in the Order Lepidoptera, was designed solely to remove doubts regarding the priority to be assigned to 12 generic names which were known to have been published in different senses in the same year (1807) but of which the relative dates of publication were unknown and would probably always remain so. Each of the names in question had been published by Fabricius in the well-known paper (in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin fur Insektenkunde*) in which he had broken ground as the first author to attempt a substantial generic classification of the Sub-Order Rhopalocera. With one exception (*Thymele*), each of these names, as published by Fabricius, was today in universal use, nine for genera of the Sub-Order Rhopalocera and two for genera of the Sub-Order Heterocera (for groups which Fabricius had mistakenly considered to be butterflies). On 19th December, 1807, the same names had been published anonymously by Illiger in a review of the first 34 plates of Jacob Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge*. As published by Illiger, these generic names applied to species entirely different from those assigned to the genera in question by Fabricius, although Illiger, in publishing these names, claimed to be applying the Fabrician nomenclature. In a number of cases (as he had shown in his application) the greatest possible confusion would arise if it were necessary to use these names in the sense employed by Illiger instead of in that employed by Fabricius. He accordingly asked the Commission to remove the cause of confusion which would arise if it were necessary to use these Fabrician names as published by Illiger by suppressing them for nomenclatorial purposes. The use of the plenary powers in this case was necessary, not because the strict application of the *Règles* would lead to confusion, but because of the impossibility of applying the *Règles* unless the plenary powers were used for the purpose of removing doubt as to the manner in which the *Règles* should be applied. Personally, he had always taken the view that, in the form in which the plenary powers had been granted in 1913, those powers could properly be used for removing confusion arising from doubts as to the manner in which the *Règles* should be applied as well as for removing confusion arising from the strict application of the *Règles*, but, as the Commission would recall, he had thought it desirable to seek a clarification of the scope of the plenary powers in this regard and had accordingly raised this question in Point (82) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17. In view of the decision taken by the Commission, when considering that

paper at the meeting noted in the margin, any doubt as to the scope of the plenary powers in this matter had now been removed. No objection of any kind had been brought forward against the present proposal and he felt sure that all lepidopterists would welcome the action proposed. The Acting President added that, in preparing the present application, he had followed strictly the interpretation of the expression "indication" given by the Commission in *Opinion 1* and had accordingly rejected as unavailable four names which, under the liberalisation of this aspect of Article 25 that had been agreed upon during the present Session were now available names. In the circumstances he asked that the decision now to be taken should cover not only the eight generic names specified in paragraph 21(ii) of the application submitted to the Commission, but also to the four names (*Brassolis*, *Euploea*, *Mechanitis*, *Thymele*) which (as already explained) he had previously rejected (paragraph 8) as invalid, but which were now available names. Turning to the question of the addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the corresponding names as published by Fabricius in 1807, the Acting President asked that of these names the following seven should now be placed on the foregoing "Official List":—*Apatura*; *Brassolis*; *Castnia*; *Emesis*; *Mechanitis*; *Neptis*; *Urania*. Four of the remaining Fabrician names (*Euploea*, *Helicopis*, *Nymphidium*, *Pontia*) had already been placed on the "Official List" before the bibliographical problem which had given rise to the present application had been discovered. The Acting President recommended that the position of these names on the "Official List" should be confirmed. The twelfth of the Fabrician generic names in question (*Thymele* Fabricius, 1807) was invalid, having as its type species the same species (*Papilio tages* Linnaeus, 1758) as the earlier genus *Erynnis* Schrank, 1801, and should therefore now be placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology." The Acting President then pointed out that the trivial names of the type species of the four genera, the position of the names of which on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" should, he had recommended, now be confirmed, were all available names and, under the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin, would therefore now be placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology." Of the five names of genera belonging to the Sub-Order Rhopalocera which he had recommended should be added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," three (*Apatura*, *Brassolis*, *Mechanitis*) possessed as their type species nominal species, the names of which were the oldest available names for the

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
9th Meeting,
Conclusion 42)

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
14th Meeting,
Conclusion 39)

species concerned; he recommended therefore that the trivial names of these species should be added to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names." In the case of the genus *Apatura* Fabricius, there was a doubt, as between two closely allied and certainly congeneric species, as to the species to which the trivial name of the type species was applicable, but, as proposals for the clarification of this doubt would be brought before the Commission later during the present meeting, there was no reason why the trivial name in question (*iris* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*) should not now be placed on the "Official List." There were slight complications in the case of the trivial names of the nominal species which were the type species of the two remaining genera: (1) The type species of *Neptis* Fabricius, 1807, had for its trivial name *aceris* Esper [1783] (published in the binominal combination *Papilio aceris*); this name was the oldest available name for the European insect so named, but that insect was commonly regarded as being a subspecies of the Asiatic species originally named *Papilio hylas* by Linnaeus in 1758; (2) The nominal species which was the type species of *Emesis* Fabricius was *Papilio ovidius* Fabricius, 1793, which was regarded by specialists as a synonym of the nominal species *Papilio cereus* Linnaeus, 1767. In accordance with the principle agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin at the time when the "Official List of Trivial Names" had been established, it would be desirable in the first of these cases to place on the "List" the trivial name both of the nominal species which was the type species of the genus concerned (*Neptis* Fabricius) and also the trivial name of the species of which it was regarded as a subspecies, while in the second case the trivial name of the nominal species which was the type species of the genus in question (*Emesis* Fabricius) should not be placed on the "List" but the trivial name of the nominal species (*cereus* Linnaeus) of which the type species (*ovidius* Fabricius) was regarded as a synonym should be so placed. The Acting President added that, while he had obtained the support of Mr. N. D. Riley and Mr. W. H. T. Tams (British Museum (Natural History)) for the proposed addition to the "Official List of Generic Names" of the two names of genera of the Sub-Order Heterocera (*Castnia*, *Urania*), he had not at that time considered the question of the oldest available names for the type species of those genera, there having been no need to do so, the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names" not then having been in existence. In the case of the type species of the first of these genera, there was, he knew, a difficult underlying problem of the relative precedence to be accorded to certain books published on unknown

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
9th Meeting,
Conclusion 42)

dates in the same year (1775), on which a decision would first have to be taken by the Commission as a question of principle. The books concerned were: (1) volume 1 of Cramer's *Uitlandsche Kapellen* (in which *Papilio icarus*, the name of the type species of the genus *Castnia* Fabricius, was first published); (2) a paper entitled *Anmerkungen zu den Hufnagelischen Tabellen der Schmetterlinge* by von Rottemburg published in volume 6 of the journal *Naturforscher*; (3) the anonymous work *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend* (the so-called *Wiener Verzeichniss*) by Schiffermüller & Denis; (4) the *Systema Entomologiae* of Fabricius. In the circumstances, he proposed that the Commission should agree to place on the "Official List" whatever might ultimately be found to be the oldest available trivial names for the type species of these genera.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) to use their plenary powers, in so far as that might be necessary:—

(a) to suppress for the purposes of Articles 25 and 34 the undermentioned generic names published in the issue of 19th December, 1807, of the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*, Halle [Jena] in an anonymous review by Illiger of the first 34 plates of Jacob Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* to have been published:—

Apatura [Illiger], 1807.
Brassolis [Illiger], 1807.
Castnia [Illiger], 1807.
Emesis [Illiger], 1807.
Euploea [Illiger], 1807.
Helicopis [Illiger], 1807.
Mechanitis [Illiger], 1807.
Neptis [Illiger], 1807.
Nymphidium [Illiger], 1807.
Pontia [Illiger], 1807.
Thymele [Illiger], 1807.
Urania [Illiger], 1807.

(b) to render available under Articles 25 and 34 all the generic names specified above other than *Thymele*, as published by Fabricius in 1807 in Volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin fur Naturkunde*;

(2) to place on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" the 12 generic names specified in (1) (a) above;

(3) to place the undermentioned generic names, with the type species severally specified below, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

<i>Name of genus</i> (1)	<i>Type species of genus specified in Col. (1)</i> (2)
<i>Apatura</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio iris</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Curtis, 1831).
<i>Brassolis</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio sophorae</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Blanchard, 1840)
<i>Castnia</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio icarus</i> Cramer, [1775] (type species selected by Latreille, 1810)
<i>Emesis</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Hesperia ovidius</i> Fabricius, 1793 [= <i>Papilio cereus</i> Linnaeus, 1767] (type species selected by Westwood, [1851])
<i>Mechanitis</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio polymlnia</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Scudder, 1875).
<i>Neptis</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio aceris</i> Esper [1783] [= <i>Papilio hylas</i> Linnaeus, 1758, ssp.] (type species selected by Crotch, 1872).
<i>Urania</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio leilus</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Latreille, 1810);

(4) to confirm the entries on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" relating to the undermentioned generic names, with the type species severally specified below:—

<i>Name of genus</i> (1)	<i>Type species of genus specified in Col. (1)</i> (2)
<i>Euploea</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio corus</i> Fabricius, 1793 (type species designated under the plenary powers in <i>Opinion 163</i>)
<i>Helicopis</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio cupido</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Scudder, 1875)

<i>Nymphidium</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio caricae</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selec- ted by Crotch, 1872)
<i>Pontia</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio daplidice</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selec- ted by Curtis, 1824)

(5) to place the generic name *Thymele* Fabricius, 1807 (type species, by selection by Westwood, 1840: *Papilio tages* Linnaeus, 1758) on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology";

(6) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" the undermentioned trivial names, being the trivial names of the type species of certain of the genera, the names of which had been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" under (3) above, with the exception of the trivial name *hylas* Linnaeus, 1758, which, from the standpoint of some specialists, was the trivial name of a subspecies of the same collective species as, and had priority over, the trivial name *aceris* Esper [1780], the type species of the genus *Neptis* Fabricius, 1807:—

aceris Esper [1783] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aceris*) (without prejudice to the prior rights of the trivial name *hylas* Linnaeus, 1758, if that name is held to apply to a subspecies of the same collective species)

cereus Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio cereus*)

hylas Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio hylas*)

iris Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*)

polyrnnia Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio polyrnnia*)

sophorae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio sophorae*);

(7) to take note that, under the decisions adopted at the time of the establishment of the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology," the trivial names of the type species of the genera specified in (4) above, being all the oldest available names for the species severally concerned, were to be placed on the foregoing "Official List";

(Previous references :
Paris Session,
7th Meeting,
Conclusion 18;
9th Meeting,
Conclusion 23)

- (8) to invite the Secretary to the Commission, in consultation with other specialists in the Order Lepidoptera, to submit proposals for the determination by the Commission, under the procedure agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin of the relative priority to be assigned to different names for the same species and to the same name for different species published in 1775 (a) by Cramer in volume 1 of his *Uitlandsche Kapellen* (b) by von Rottemburg in a paper entitled *Anmerkungen zu den Hufnagelischen Tabellen der Schmetterlinge* published in volume 6 of the journal *Naturforscher* (c) by Schiffermüller & Denis in the anonymous work *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend*, and (d) by Fabricius in his *Systema Entomologiae*;
- (9) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" whichever might, in the light of the decision on (8) above, be found to be the oldest available trivial name for the type species of the genus *Castnia* Fabricius, 1807.
- (10) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" whichever, after consultation with specialists, was found to be the oldest available trivial name for the type species of the genus *Urania* Fabricius, 1807;
- (11) to render *Opinions* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (6), and, when completed, in (9) and (10) above.

'Hygriobia'
Latreille, 1804
(Class Insecta,
Order Coleoptera) :
emendation of, to
"*Hygrobia*"
under Article 19

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)159) submitted jointly by Mr. H. E. Andrewes (Leicester, England), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (formerly Professor of Entomology, Imperial College of Science, London), Dr. K. G. Blair (British Museum (Natural History), London), Mr. M. Cameron (British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring), and Mr. C. E. Tottenham (University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge, England), asking for a ruling from the Commission that the spelling of the name *Hygriobia* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) should be emended to *Hygrobia* (Andrewes, Balfour-Browne, Blair, Cameron and Tottenham, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 270). It was stated by the applicants that the emended spelling *Hygrobia* was in universal use and had been used by workers ever since Latreille (1817) had published the name in this form. The reversion to the original spelling of *Hygriobia*

would, in the view of the applicants, cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would cause greater confusion than uniformity.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, although the applicants had asked the Commission to use their plenary powers to secure the end sought in their petition, the first matter which should be considered was whether the original spelling *Hygriobia* was correct or defective and, in the latter event, whether under Article 19, it should be emended. Not until an answer had been given to these questions could the possible use of the plenary powers be appropriately considered. Only one comment had been received in regard to this case, namely a letter from Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.), who had expressed his strong personal objection to the use of the plenary powers in this case, but had offered no observations on the prior question of the applicability or otherwise of Article 19 to the name under consideration.

IN THE DISCUSSION on this case the view was expressed that, having regard to the fact that the genus under consideration was a genus of water beetles and to the common use of compound words consisting, in part of the Greek adjective *ὑγρός*, meaning "wet," it was evident that the correct spelling of this generic name was "*Hygrobia*" and that the barbarism "*Hygriobia*" was due either to a "faute d'orthographe" or to a "faute d'impression." Article 19, accordingly, applied to this case, and in consequence the spelling of this name should be emended from *Hygriobia* to *Hygrobia*. In these circumstances, no question arose of the use of the plenary powers in this case.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) that it was "évident" that the spelling as *Hygriobia* of the generic name *Hygriobia* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) was due either to a "faute d'orthographe" or to a "faute d'impression" ;
- (2) that, in view of (1) above the foregoing generic name was, under Article 19, to be emended to *Hygrobia* ;
- (3) to place the generic name *Hygrobia* Latreille, 1804 (type species, by monotypy : *Dytiscus hermanni* Fabricius, 1775) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" ;

- (4) to place the trivial name *tardus* Herbst, 1779 (as published in the binominal combination *Dytiscus tardus*) (the oldest available name for the type species of *Hygrobia* Latreille, 1804) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";
- (5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

"Schwagerina"
von Möller, 1877
(Class Rhizopoda,
Order
Foraminifera):
determination of
type species of

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application (file Z.N.(S.)87) submitted by Professor Hubert G. Schenck (Stanford University, California, U.S.A.) asking for a ruling on the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) (Schenck, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1 : 271-272). Professor Schenck explained that this monotypical genus had undoubtedly been based upon a misidentified type species. The only species cited by von Möller under this genus was *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842, but a recent examination of Ehrenberg's type material by modern critical methods had shown that the species so named by Ehrenberg differed morphologically from that on which von Möller had based the genus *Schwagerina*, belonging not only to a different species but differing generically therefrom. The species so misidentified by von Möller was later named *Schwagerina moelleri* by Rauser-Chernoussova in 1937. Thus, some 60 years elapsed before the error of identification by von Möller was detected and during that period the species which that author had misidentified as *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg had been universally accepted as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina*. When in 1935 Dr. Carl O. Dunbar had detected this error, he had inquired of the Commission whether in the exceptional circumstances they would be prepared to entertain an application that they should use their plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* the species which von Möller had intended to refer to, when he established that genus, in place of the species to which, through an error of identification, he did in fact then refer. Unfortunately, at that moment the Secretaryship of the Commission had been vacant, and Dr. Dunbar had been unable to obtain any reply from the Commission. Accordingly, he and Dr. Skinner had decided that they had no option but to apply to this case the interpretation of Article 30 given in the Commission's *Opinion* 65. They had therefore accepted the true *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg as the type species of *Schwagerina* von Möller, and had established a genus (*Pseudoschwagerina* Dunbar and Skinner, 1935) for the

species which von Möller had misidentified with *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg and for its immediate allies. Since then most workers had adopted *Pseudoschwagerina* in place of *Schwagerina* in its old sense and had applied the latter name to the true *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg. In the light of these events, Professor Schenck considered that uniformity and stability would best be secured by the Commission confirming *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842, as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877. Professor Schenck was supported in this view by Professor M. L. Thompson (University of Kansas, Lawrence, U.S.A.).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the Commission would, he felt sure, regret the delay which had occurred in dealing with this case, for, if it had been possible to take action promptly when this problem was first brought to notice by Dr. Carl O. Dunbar, the Commission, by using their plenary powers, could have saved the name *Schwagerina* von Möller for use in the then universally accepted sense, namely as the generic name for a widely-known guide fossil to the Lower Permian throughout the Northern Hemisphere. For the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller was clearly a genus based upon a misidentified species, and, as such, could readily have been dealt with by the Commission under *Opinion* 65 and the fuller *Opinion* (*Opinion* 168) on the same subject which they had adopted at their Lisbon Session, for at that time it was clear that the substitution as the type species of the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller of the species (*Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg) actually cited by von Möller for the species (*Schwagerina moelleri* Rauser-Chernoussova) to which he had intended to refer would certainly have led (as, in fact, it did lead) to confusion and instability in nomenclature. At the present time, however, the position was different, for the "agony" (as one leading American paleontologist had termed it) involved in the change of the type species of *Schwagerina* had been overcome and workers were in general accustomed to the new use of that generic name. Professor Schenck (who before the present practice had become crystallised, had favoured the recognition of *Schwagerina moelleri* as the type species of *Schwagerina*) now recommended that in the altered circumstances the Commission should give a ruling that the true *Borealis princeps* of Ehrenberg was to be recognised as the type species. He (the Acting President), as Secretary to the Commission, had had considerable correspondence with specialists in regard to this case, notably Professor M. L. Thompson, Dr. Carl O. Dunbar and Dr. Myra Keen, all of whom favoured the course now pro-

(Previous reference:
Lisbon Session,
2nd Meeting,
Conclusion 23)

posed. In addition, he had raised this question at a widely-attended meeting on nomenclature held at Ottawa at the beginning of that year during the annual meetings of the Paleontological Society of America and of the Geological Society of America. All the specialists then present had favoured the solution now proposed. In addition, this case had been considered by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, which (by 11 affirmative and no negative votes) had adopted a resolution supporting the action recommended by Professor Schenck. The Acting President added that such a decision would be in strict conformity with the provisions which it had been agreed (at the meeting noted in the margin) should be inserted in the *Règles* to give effect to the decisions relating to the interpretation of Article 30 given in *Opinions* 65 and 168, for, although, in general, those provisions enjoined the Commission to use their plenary powers to designate as the type species of a genus based upon a misidentified type species the species intended by the original author of the genus (as contrasted with the species actually cited by that author), there had been inserted, as the Commission would recall, a saving clause directing that the plenary powers should not be used even where a genus had clearly been established on a misidentified type species, in cases where the Commission considered that such a use of the plenary powers would lead to greater confusion than uniformity. In his (the Acting President's) view, the present was such a case, and he accordingly recommended the Commission to approve the application submitted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to place on record their regret at the delay which had occurred in reaching a decision on the present case, a delay which, the Commission recognised, had prejudiced the issues involved ;
- (2) that, under the *Règles* the type species of the monotypical genus *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) was the species *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842, the sole species cited by von Möller, when he first published the name *Schwagerina*, and not the species which that author had misidentified with the foregoing species and had before him when he established the foregoing genus, which, specialists were agreed, was the species that was at that time unnamed but had since received the name *Schwagerina moelleri* Rauser-Chernoussova, 1937

- (3) that, having regard to the delay referred to in (1) above, and without prejudice to the decision which might have been taken if the case had been dealt with promptly and before therefore the situation had developed in the way that it did subsequent to 1935, it was not desirable in existing circumstances to use the plenary powers to vary the application of the *Règles* in the present case;
- (4) in view of (3) above to place the undermentioned generic names, with the type species severally specified below, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

Schwagerina von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) (type species, by monotypy: *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842)

Pseudoschwagerina Dunbar & Skinner, 1935 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera) (type species, by original designation: *Schwagerina uddeni* Beede and Kniker, 1924);

- (5) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

moelleri Rauser-Chernoussova, 1937 (as published in the binominal combination *Schwagerina moelleri*)

princeps Ehrenberg, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Borealis princeps*)

uddeni Beede and Kniker, 1924 (as published in the binominal combination *Schwagerina uddeni*);

- (6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (2) to (5) above.

"*Alydus*"
Fabricius, 1803
(Class Insecta,
Order Hemiptera):
validation of, under
the plenary powers

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration:—

- (a) a paper (file Z.N.(S.)160) by Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) containing a discussion of the status of the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), the relationship of that name to the name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, and the relationship of the latter name to the name *Nabis* Latreille [1802–1803], and suggesting alternative methods by which the name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803, might be conserved (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 273–274);

(b) an application (file Z.N.(S.)160) submitted jointly by Mr. E. E. Green (Camberley, England) and Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) for the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the generic name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, and the consequent validation of the name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Green & China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 275).

The present application had been submitted to the Commission by the Royal Entomological Society of London on the recommendation of their Committee on Generic Nomenclature on the basis of data submitted to that Committee by its Hemiptera Sub-Committee (in a Report published by the Society in 1943 as an annex to the Eighth Report of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature). The paper by Dr. China (see (a) above) was an extract from the paper which that specialist had submitted to the Hemiptera Sub-Committee, while the joint paper by Mr. Green and Dr. China (see (b) above) was an extract from the Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee. The object of the application was to validate the name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (type species; *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758), the portion of the application relating to the older name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, having been introduced only because certain authors (e.g. Reuter (1888), Kirkaldy (1900), Stichel (1925)) had synonymised *Coriscus dauci* Schrank, 1801 (the type species of the genus *Coriscus* Schrank) with *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758 (the type species of *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803), notwithstanding the substantial structural difference between these genera noted by Schrank in his original description of the genus *Coriscus* and of his express statement that the sole included species (then referred to by him as the "Möhrensichelwanze" and later named by him *Coriscus dauci*) was not the same as *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus. Accordingly, from the standpoint of the authors referred to above and of any other specialists who shared their taxonomic opinion regarding the identification of *Coriscus dauci* Schrank with *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803, was a synonym of *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796. Dr. China and Mr. Green did not accept the taxonomic conclusions of the foregoing authors, but, in order to put an end to any doubts on this matter, they had recommended in the Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee that the Commission should be asked to use their plenary powers to designate *Coriscus crassipes* Schrank, 1801, as the type species of the genus *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796. The effect of this proposal would be to make *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, and

Nabis Latreille [1802-1803], different names for the same genus. The applicants attached importance to the maintenance of the name *Nabis* Latreille, but had been under the misapprehension that their proposal would make *Coriscus* Schrank a synonym of *Nabis* Latreille, although it was the older of the two names, in view of the fact that (in Opinion 104) the Commission had placed the name *Nabis* Latreille on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology."

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that, when in 1944 he, as Secretary to the Commission, had prepared the present application for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, he had drawn the attention of the applicants to the fact that the name *Nabis* Latreille had been placed on the "Official List" in the belief that under the *Règles* it was an available name, and that, as it had not been validated by the Commission under the plenary powers, it was liable to be removed from the "Official List," if it were later found to be an invalid name. As the result of this correspondence, the applicants had decided to amend their application to the form in which it was later published in the *Bulletin* (see (b) above). In its revised form the application asked for the suppression of the generic name *Coriscus* Schrank under the plenary powers. This action would at one stroke both remove any doubt as to the availability of the name *Alydus* Fabricius and safeguard fully the position of *Nabis* Latreille on the "Official List." Subsequent to this correspondence but prior to the publication of the revised application, Dr. R. I. Sailer (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) had written (1945) objecting to the original proposal on the ground that it was incomplete and, if adopted, would lead to *Nabis* Latreille being sunk as a synonym of *Coriscus* Schrank. He further expressed the view that during the last 25 years the name *Coriscus* Schrank had become well established in the literature in place of *Alydus* Fabricius and that, in view of the fact that its suppression in the manner proposed by Green and China in the Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee would endanger the important name *Nabis* Latreille, the proposal submitted by the Sub-Committee should be rejected. In his reply, the Acting President (as Secretary to the Commission) had informed Dr. Sailer that he shared his view that, as submitted by the Sub-Committee, the proposal regarding *Alydus* Fabricius, would, if adopted, throw *Nabis* Latreille into synonymy with *Coriscus* Schrank and that, in order to remove this objection to their proposal, Dr. China and Mr. Green had agreed upon a re-wording of their application which would safeguard fully the position of

Nabis Latreille. The application had subsequently been advertised, but the advertisement had elicited no objection to the action proposed by Dr. China.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to use their plenary powers :—
 - (a) to suppress the name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) for the purposes of Article 25, though not for those of Article 34 ;
 - (b) to validate the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;
- (2) to place the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (type species, selected by Curtis, 1831: *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" ;
- (3) to place the name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" ;
- (4) to confirm the entry on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the name *Nabis* Latreille [1802–1803] ;
- (5) to place the trivial name *calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Cimex calcaratus*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" ;
- (6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

"Salda"
Fabricius, 1803
(Class Insecta,
Order Hemiptera) :
designation of type
species of, under
the plenary powers

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

- (a) a paper (file Z.N.(S.)161) by Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) on the status of the name *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 276) ;
- (b) an application submitted jointly by Mr. E. E. Green (Camberley, England) and Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to designate *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Green & China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 276–277) ;

It was explained in the application that the universally accepted concept represented by the name *Salda* Fabricius, 1801, was based upon the belief that *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758, had been correctly selected as the type species of this genus by Blanchard in 1848 (*in Orbigny, Dict. univ. Hist. nat.*, 11; 311). It was now realised that the Heteroptera section of the Disciples' Edition of Cuvier's *Règne Animal*, in which Blanchard had selected *Cimex grylloides* Linnaeus, 1761, as the type species of *Salda* Fabricius, was published as early as 1838 and therefore this type selection had priority over that of *Cimex littoralis* in 1848. The acceptance of *Cimex grylloides* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus would, however, lead to confusion, for it would involve the transfer of the genus *Salda* Fabricius to another family (now known as the LYGAEIDAE), where it would replace the well-known name *Geocoris* Fallén, 1814, while the family now known as the SALDIDAE would be left without a name.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application, like that relating to the name *Alydus* Fabricius, which the Commission had just considered, had been submitted to the Commission by the Royal Entomological Society of London, on the recommendation of their Committee on Generic Nomenclature, acting on the advice of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee, the members of which were Dr. China and Mr. Green. The application had been advertised subsequent to publication in the *Bulletin*. The only objection received had come from Dr. Richard Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) who considered that the grounds advanced in the application were insufficient to justify the use by the Commission of their plenary powers.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that the application submitted contained sufficient evidence as to the likelihood of confusion arising if the *Règles* were strictly applied in this case and that the application should therefore be granted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

- (a) to set aside all selections of a type species for the genus *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) made prior to the present decision ;
- (b) to designate *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

- (2) to place the generic name *Salda* Fabricius, 1803, with the type species designated in (1) (b) above, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" ;
- (3) to place the trivial name *littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Cimex littoralis*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" ;
- (4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Names of ten genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta) based upon misidentified type species : (1) type species of "Gastrodes" Westwood, 1840, designated under the plenary powers ; (2) type species of remaining genera similarly designated conditionally

21. THE COMMISSION turned next to consider the application (file Z.N.(S.)144) submitted by Dr. W. E. China (British Museum (Natural History), London) in regard to the names of ten genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta), each of which, it was considered, was based upon a misidentified type species. The applications so submitted sought in each case the use of the plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus concerned the species originally intended (as contrasted with the species actually cited) by the author of the generic name in question. The applications were the following :—

- (a) *Aquarius* Schellenberg, 1800
Gerris paludum Schellenberg, 1800, had been selected as the type species of this genus by Kirkaldy, 1906, but it was considered that the species referred to under this name by Schellenberg was *Cimex najas* De Geer, 1773. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of the genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1 : 277-278).
- (b) *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834
Cimex maurus Linnaeus, 1758, had been selected as the type species of this genus by Westwood (1840), but it was considered that the species referred to under this name by Hahn was *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1 : 278-279).
- (c) *Beosus* Amyot & Serville, 1843
This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by the authors of the generic name being *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius, 1803. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species

which Amyot and Serville intended to refer to was *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 279-280).

(d) *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by Spinola being *Acanthia costata* Fabricius, 1794. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Spinola intended to refer to was *Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 281).

(e) *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827

Tingis eryngii Latreille, 1804, had been designated by Curtis at the time (1827) that he first published the generic name *Dictyonota*, but it was considered that the species so referred to under this name by Curtis was *Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber, 1844. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 282).

(f) *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by Westwood being *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus, 1758. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Westwood intended to refer to was *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 283).

(g) *Oncotylus* Fieber, 1858

Kirkaldy (1906) selected as the type species of this genus the species which Fieber had referred thereto under the name *Capsus tanaceti* Fallén, 1807, but, in making this selection, Kirkaldy had made it clear that he realised that Fieber had misidentified Fallén's species and that the species which he (Kirkaldy) was then selecting as the type species was *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873 (i.e. the species to which Fieber had intended to refer when he entered the trivial name *tanaceti* Fallén as the name of a species of this genus). Nevertheless, under the *Règles* the type species

of this genus was the true *Capsus tanaceti* of Fallén. The Commission were asked to designate *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873, as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 284).

(h) *Pachylops* Fieber, 1858

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by Fieber being *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum, 1855. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Fieber intended to refer to was *Litosoma bicolor* Douglas & Scott, 1868. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 285).

(i) *Pilophorus* Hahn, 1826

This genus was monotypical, the sole species referred thereto by Hahn being *Cimex bifasciatus* Fabricius, 1775. It was considered that the citation of this name was due to a misidentification and that the species which Hahn intended to refer to was *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767. The Commission were asked to designate the latter species as the type species of this genus (China, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 286).

(j) *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803

Curtis (1838) selected *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus. It was considered that the species referred to under this name by Fabricius was *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776 (the species which, under (b) above, the Commission were asked to designate as the type species of the genus *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834). The acceptance of *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus as the type species of *Tetyra* Fabricius would (i) involve the transfer of the name *Tetyra* Fabricius from the American, to the European list, (ii) leave without a name the American genus now known as *Tetyra*, and (iii) cause the name *Eurygaster* Laporte, 1832 (a name of some importance in economic entomology as including pests of wheat) to fall as a synonym of *Tetyra*. Such consequences would be open to the strongest objection. It was accordingly proposed that the Commission should designate as the type species of *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803, the species so selected by the next author after Curtis to select a type species for this genus, i.e. Kirkaldy (1900).

The species in question was cited by Fabricius under the name *Cimex arcuata* Fabricius, 1794, but that name was invalid, being a homonym of *Cimex arcuatus* Gmelin, 1789. The oldest available name for the Fabrician species was *Cimex antillarum*, a *nom. nov.* published by Kirkaldy in 1909. It was this nominal species which it was proposed that the Commission should designate as the type species of the genus *Tetyra* Fabricius 1803.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that unfortunately through some oversight the Commission File (file Z.N.(S.)144) dealing with the present series of applications had not been included among those which he had brought with him to Paris to assist the Commission in the consideration of problems calling for decision. So far as he could recall, no objections to the action proposed in these cases had been received from any source. These cases appeared to be exactly of the kind envisaged in *Opinion* 168. They all related to genera based upon misidentified species, where the acceptance of the type species actually cited (as contrasted with that intended) by the original author would certainly cause great confusion. In such cases the Commission were now under an obligation to use their plenary powers to avoid disturbance in accepted nomenclature.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) said that, as a hemipterist, he was familiar with the problem presented by the name *Gastrodes* Westwood (case (f) above) and was in full agreement with the conclusions reached by Dr. China. He accordingly supported the proposal that the plenary powers should be used to designate *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914, as the type species of this genus.

IN THE ENSUING DISCUSSION the view was generally expressed that all the necessary data had been submitted by Dr. China in support of the remaining applications and that those applications were well founded. It was felt, however, that, before a final decision was taken on these cases, it was desirable to make sure, by reference to the Commission's file, that no adverse comment of any kind had been received from any specialist in the groups concerned. If any such adverse comments were found to have been received, the application concerned should be resubmitted to the Commission, but if no such adverse comments had been received, the Secretary to the Commission should prepare *Opinions* in the sense proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

- (a) to set aside the designation by Westwood of *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the monotypical genus *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) ;
- (b) to designate *Gastrodes abietum* Bergroth, 1914, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;
- (2) to place the generic name *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840, with the type species specified in (1)(b) above, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;
- (3) to place the trivial name *abietum* Bergroth, 1914 (as published in the binominal combination *Gastrodes abietum*), on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;
- (4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above ;
- (5) as regards the names of the nine genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta) specified below :—

(a) that, if an examination of the Commission's file Z.N.(S.)144 showed that no objection to the action proposed had been received from any source, the plenary powers should be used to designate as the type species of the genera concerned the species severally specified below, but that, if in any case it were to be found that such an objection had been received, the application concerned should be resubmitted to the Commission for further consideration :—

<i>Name of genus</i>	<i>Name of species proposed to be designated, under the plenary powers as the type species of the genus specified in Col. (1)</i>
----------------------	---

(1)	(2)
<i>Aquarius</i> Schellenberg, 1800.	<i>Cimex najas</i> De Geer, 1773.
<i>Bellocoris</i> Hahn, 1834.	<i>Cimex austriacus</i> Schrank, 1776.

<i>Beosus</i> Amyot & Serville, 1843.	<i>Cimex maritimus</i> Scopoli, 1763.
<i>Catoplatus</i> Spinola, 1837.	<i>Tingis fabricii</i> Stål, 1868.
<i>Dictyonota</i> Curtis, 1827.	<i>Dictyonota strichnoca</i> Fieber, 1844.
<i>Oncotylus</i> Fieber, 1858.	<i>Oncotylus punctipes</i> Reuter, 1873.
<i>Pachylops</i> Fieber, 1858.	<i>Litosoma bicolor</i> Douglas & Scott, 1868.
<i>Pilophorus</i> Hahn, 1826.	<i>Cimex clavatus</i> Linnaeus, 1767.
<i>Tetyra</i> Fabricius, 1803.	<i>Cimex antillarum</i> Kirkaldy, 1909;

(b) that, where under Sub-Conclusion (5) (a) above, the plenary powers were used to designate as the type species of the genus concerned the species specified in Col. (2) of the table annexed to the said Sub-Conclusion, the generic name specified in Col. (1) should be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the trivial name specified in Col. (2) as the name of the type species of the genus concerned should be placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(c) that in every case where, under (5) (a) above, the plenary powers are used to designate as the type species of a genus the species specified against the name of that genus in Col. (2) of the table annexed to that Conclusion, an *Opinion* should be rendered recording the decision so taken.

(*Note by the Secretary to the Commission.*—

I have examined the Commission's file Z.N. (S.) 144, and find (i) that Dr. R. I. Sailer (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) has registered his support for each of the proposals specified above, and (ii) that no adverse comment on the action proposed has been received from any source. (Signed) Francis Hemming, Secretariat of the Commission, London, N.W.1. 15th September 1948.)

**Certain applications
not yet
published in the
"Bulletin of
Zoological
Nomenclature":
the Commission's
files relating to, to
be examined in turn**

22. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the application submitted by Dr. W. E. China in regard to the names of certain genera in the Order Hemiptera (Class Insecta) which the Commission had just considered completed their examination of the applications that had so far been published in the *Bulletin of*

Zoological Nomenclature. In addition, however, there was a considerable number of applications relating to individual nomenclatorial problems awaiting decision, the texts of which, through lack of time and lack of funds, had not been published in the *Bulletin*. Some of these applications raised complicated issues and in these cases publication in the *Bulletin* was desirable before decisions were taken by the Commission, for such publication might serve to elicit valuable additional information. There were, however, a good many cases where the issue raised was very simple and the likelihood of additional information of value being elicited through publication in the *Bulletin* was consequently remote. Before leaving London for Paris, he (the Acting President), as Secretary to the Commission, had accordingly picked out the Commission Files (of the Z.N.(S.) Series) relating to a number of applications falling in this class, believing that in these cases the Commission would readily be able to reach decisions on the basis of an examination of the Z.N.(S.) files concerned, containing, as they did, not only the original applications submitted but also all the correspondence which had taken place in regard thereto. He (the Acting President) had brought the Commission Files in question with him to the present meeting and he hoped that the Commission would now proceed to examine them. In view of the considerable period which, owing to the war, had elapsed since some of these applications were first received, it was clearly very desirable that decisions should now be taken in every case where the Commission were satisfied that the action required was clear.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine, in turn, the Commission's Files (of the Z.N.(S.) Series) relating to applications in regard to individual nomenclatorial problems, which the Acting President, as Secretary to the Commission, had brought to Paris from London, with a view to reaching decisions on the questions submitted in every case where the evidence afforded by those Files showed clearly what action should be taken.

The trivial name "idas" Linnaeus, 1758, (as published in the binominal combination "Papilio idas") suppressed, and the trivial name "idas" Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination

23. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)60, containing an application submitted jointly by Dr. Henry Beuret (Neuwelt, Bâle, Switzerland) and Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) asking the Commission (1) to suppress the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*), a name which, being a *nomen dubium*, served no useful purpose, in order (2) to validate the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combina-

**"Papilio idas")
(Class Insecta,
Order Lepidoptera)
validated, and its
application defined,
under the plenary
powers, and matters
incidental thereto**

tion *Papilio idas*) for the species which had been known since 1871 up to about ten years ago by the trivial name *argyrogynomon* Bergstrasser 1779, a name which it had now been found was applicable to a different, though closely allied, species (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application related to the name to be applied to a common Palaearctic species of butterfly, the nomenclature of which had become so confused that stability could not be secured unless the Commission used their plenary powers to assist that end. The confusion arose through the mistakes made in the past in applying trivial names to three very similar species, which might for convenience be called species "A," species "B," and species "C." Linnaeus in 1758 had recognised one only of these species (species "A"), to which he had applied the name *Papilio argus*. In 1761, he had, however, given the name *Papilio idas* to the Swedish subspecies of species "B," though, owing to the fact that species "B" and "C" both occurred in Sweden and their distinguishing characters had not been detected until more than a 100 years after Linnaeus's day, it was possible that, when he wrote the description of *Papilio idas*, he had before him specimens of both these species. The name so given was, however, invalid, being a homonym of *Papilio idas* Linnaeus, 1758, a name given to an Oriental Hesperiid which it had never been found possible to identify to the satisfaction of specialists in that group. The first major element of confusion was introduced by Schiffermüller and Denis (1775) who, on clearly recognising the characters which distinguished species "B" from species "A," applied to the former the trivial name *argus* Linnaeus, 1758 (which properly belonged to species "A") and gave a new name (*aegon*) to species "A." This mistake persisted until 1871, when Kirby restored the name *argus* Linnaeus to its rightful owner. It was at this stage, however, that Kirby introduced the second major cause of confusion into this problem by applying to species "B" (which required a trivial name on ceasing to be known (incorrectly) as *argus* Linnaeus) the trivial name *argyrogynomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binomial combination *Papilio argyrogynomon*), believing that to be the oldest available name for the collective species "B." From then onwards until 1935, that species was almost universally known by that name. The opening phase of the next stage was marked by the discovery by Chapman in 1917 of the existence of a third species (species "C") which had hitherto been confused with species "B." To this new species Chapman gave the

trivial name *aegus* Chapman (in the binominal combination *Plebeius aegus*). It was not long before it was realised that other subspecies of species "C" had already been named, prior to the publication of the trivial name *aegus* Chapman, by authors who (erroneously) supposed that the insects in question were subspecies of species "B." In consequence, a general search of the literature was made for the purpose of determining the oldest available trivial name for species "C." This search led ultimately to the discovery by Dr. Beuret (one of the present applicants) of the third major error in the nomenclature of this group, namely the discovery that the trivial name *argyrogномон* Bergstrasser, for so long and so universally applied to species "B," was in fact applicable not to that species but to species "C." In retrospect, it was clear to him (the Acting President) that at that point the best course would have been to ask the Commission to use their plenary powers to suppress the name *argyrogномон* Bergstrasser, the transfer of which from species "B" to species "C" could not fail to cause the utmost confusion. However, that course had not been taken at that time, and in consequence there had followed a long period of confusion. This confusion had been greatly aggravated by the impossibility of determining what trivial name was properly applicable to the collective species "B," which once again (as in 1871) was without an accepted trivial name. This difficulty arose from the fact that the inadequacy of the original descriptions, the crude nature of the original figures (in those cases where figures had been published by the original authors) and the absence of type specimens made it impossible to determine whether any, and, if so, which of the trivial names given by early authors to nominal species commonly synonymised with species "B" really represented subspecies of that collective species or whether they represented subspecies of species "C." It was this nomenclatorial *impasse* which had led Dr. Beuret and other specialists to revert to a proposal originally advanced (in a different form) by Dr. Roger Verity (1913) that the best way to secure stability for the nomenclature of these species would be to acquire authority to apply to species "B" the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761. This proposal had many important advantages: (1) it involved no disturbance whatever in the nomenclature of other groups, for the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758, the suppression of which was presupposed by this proposal, would not cause a ripple anywhere, that name being regarded as a *nomen dubium* and in consequence not being in use by any author; (2) the name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761, had never been applied by any author to any of the species here under consideration,

apart from species "B"; if therefore, that name were to be applied officially to species "B" (and, subspecifically, to the Swedish subspecies of that species), every worker would in future know to what species reference was being made when the name *idas* was used; (3) the very early date (1761) of the trivial name *idas* provided an insurance against the risk of there being some earlier trivial name which would take priority over the name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761, for the collective species "B"; (4) a settlement on these lines would not prejudice the taxonomic question of the relationship of insects "B" and "C," since any worker who (contrary to the present general opinion) might regard these two insects as conspecific would be free to treat as the name of a subspecies of the collective species "B" the name *argyrogynomon* Bergstrasser (the oldest available name for the group of subspecies treated by the present applicants as together constituting the collective species "C").

Continuing, the Acting President said that the present proposal was supported by all the leading specialists in the group concerned, including Dr. Roger Verity (Florence, Italy), Mr. N. D. Riley (British Museum (Natural History), London), the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London), Dr. V. Nabokov (Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, U.S.A.) and Mr. B. J. Lempke (Amsterdam, Netherlands). The Acting President added that, if, as he hoped, the Commission were now to use their plenary powers in the manner recommended, it would be necessary for them, when placing the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761, on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology," to specify that the name so stabilised was to be held to apply to the species which he had referred to under the name species "B"; this could best be done by citing one of Chapman's figures of the male genitalia, those being the characters by which that species could most readily be distinguished from the species that he had referred to as species "C." At the same time the trivial name *argyrogynomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (which in Opinion 169 the Commission had designated under their plenary powers as the type species of *Lycaeides* Hübner, [1819]) and the trivial name *argus* Linnaeus, 1758 (the type species of the genus *Plebejus* Kluk, 1802) should also be added to this "Official List," bibliographical references being inserted to show that the first of these names was to be applied to species "C" and the second to species "A."

(Previous reference:
Lisbon Session,
2nd Meeting,
Conclusion 23)

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that, as had been indicated by

the Acting President, he strongly supported the present proposal. He was convinced that stability would never be attained in the nomenclature of this group of species without the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. The settlement proposed would, he felt confident, be welcomed warmly by all interested specialists.

IN DISCUSSION it was agreed that this was a particularly clear case for the use of the plenary powers to put an end to a state of confusion in nomenclature which could be remedied in no other way.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to use their plenary powers :—
 - (a) to suppress the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) ;
 - (b) to validate the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*) ;
 - (c) to direct :—
 - (i) that the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*), validated as specified in (b) above, should be applied to the species (the nominotypical subspecies of which was described by Linnaeus from specimens collected in Sweden), the male genitalia of which show the characters exhibited in the photograph published by Chapman (T. A.) in 1917 as figure 7 of plate III in Volume 14 of Oberthür's *Etudes de la Lépidoptérologie comparée* (photograph of the male genitalia of a specimen collected at Allos (Basses-Alpes, France) and figured as “*Plebeius argus* var. *alpina*”);
 - (ii) that the trivial name *argyrogynomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrogynomon*) should be applied to the species (the nominotypical subspecies of which was described by Bergstrasser from specimens collected in the “Bruchköhl Wald” in the “Grafschaft Hanau-Münzenberg”), the male genitalia of which show the

characters exhibited in the photograph published by Chapman (T.A.) in 1917 as figure 23 on plate VIII in Volume 14 of Oberthür's *Etudes de la Lépidoptérologie comparée* (photograph of the male genitalia of a specimen collected at Versoix (Switzerland) and figured as "*Plebeius aegus*");

(iii) that the trivial name *argus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argus*) should be applied to the species (the nomino-typical subspecies of which was described by Linnaeus from specimens collected in Sweden), the male genitalia of which show the characters exhibited in the photograph published by Chapman (T.A.) in 1909 as figure 1 on plate XX in Volume 3 of Tutt's *Natural History of the British Butterflies* (photograph of the male genitalia figured as "*Plebeius argus*");

(2) to place the trivial name *idas* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*), suppressed under (1) (a) above, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(3) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

idas Linnaeus, 1761 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio idas*), as validated under (1) (b) above and as defined in (1) (c) (i) above;

argyrogynomon Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrogynomon*), as defined in (1) (c) (ii) above;

argus Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argus*), as defined in (1) (c) (iii) above;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

Six generic names
in the Order
Lepidoptera (Class
Insecta) placed on

24. Arising out of the discussion recorded in the preceding Conclusion, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, when discussing the

the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and three generic names in the same Order placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology"

(Previous reference:
Lisbon Session,
2nd Meeting,
Conclusion 23)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
9th Meeting,
Conclusion 42)

trivial name *argyrogномон* Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrogномон*), he had reminded the Commission that at Lisbon in 1935 they had used their plenary powers to designate the foregoing species as the type species of the genus *Lycaeides* Hübner [1819]. Now that the Commission had placed the foregoing trivial name on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology," it was desirable that they should stabilise also the name of the genus of which that species was the type species, by placing that generic name on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology." Action in this sense, if taken now, would merely anticipate action which would in any case be taken a little later, for, as the Commission would remember, they had agreed during their present Session (at the meeting noted in margin) that every nomenclaturally available name which was also the oldest available name for the genus or species concerned which had formed the subject of a decision by the Commission should now be placed on the appropriate "Official List," irrespective of whether a decision to that effect had been expressly recorded in the *Opinion* setting out the Commission's decision in regard to the name in question, and had invited him (the Acting President) in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission to examine all the *Opinions* so far rendered by the Commission for the purpose of giving effect to the foregoing decision. If, as he recommended, the Commission were now to deal expressly with the generic name *Lycaeides* Hübner, it would be convenient if at the same time they were to deal also with the other generic names, the type species of which had also been varied under the plenary powers on the same occasion. As could be seen by reference to the *Official Record of Proceedings* of the Meeting concerned (1943, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*, 1: 23-25), there were altogether nine names involved. Of these, however, three names (*Latiорина* Tutt, 1909; *Orpheides* Hübner [1819]; *Spilothyrus* Duponchel, 1835) were the names of nominal genera which were duplicates, i.e. objective synonyms, of other nominal genera (*Agriades* Hübner [1819]; *Princeps* Hübner [1807]; *Carcharodus* Hübner [1819]). The Commission had only been asked to use their plenary powers in the case of these duplicate nominal genera, in order to prevent these latter from ceasing to be synonyms, a result which would otherwise have followed from the decision by the Commission to vary the type species of the genera having the older names. The names of these three duplicate genera should now be placed on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology." All the other names concerned were available and, with one exception, were in universal use. These names should therefore now be placed on the

"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology." The exception was the name *Princeps* Hübner [1807], which was treated by all specialists as a synonym of *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758, its type species, *Papilio demodocus* Esper [1798], being regarded as congeneric with *Papilio machaon* Linnaeus, 1758, the type species of *Papilio* Linnaeus. In spite, therefore, of the Commission having used their plenary powers to designate the type species of the genus *Princeps* Hübner [1807], he recommended that that name should not now be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology."

Turning to the question of the admission to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" of the trivial names of the type species of the genera discussed above, the Acting President said that two only called for comment. The species concerned were the type species respectively of the genera *Euchloë* Hübner and *Polyommatus* Latreille. In the first of these cases the difficulty was due to uncertainty as to the taxonomic limits of the collective species concerned, while in the second of the cases bibliographical uncertainties made it impossible at the present time to determine what was the oldest available name for the species concerned.

The type species of the genus *Euchloë* had for its trivial name the name *esperi* Kirby, 1871, which had originally been published as a subspecific trivial name, its author considering that the insect in question represented the South of France subspecies of a collective species to which the trivial name *ausonia* Hübner was then applied. While *esperi* Kirby was still accepted as a subspecies, most specialists now regarded the oldest available name for the collective species to which it belonged as *orientalis* Bremer, 1864. Some specialists, however, considered that the species was not confined to the Palaearctic Region but that the North American group of subspecies should be united with the Palaearctic subspecies. From the standpoint of these systematists, the oldest available trivial name for the collective species was *creusa* Doubleday, [1847] (as published in the binomial combination *Anthocharis creusa*). In order to avoid the appearance of passing judgment on these taxonomic questions, the Commission would be well advised to follow in this case the procedure which, on the suggestion of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán, they had agreed to adopt in analogous circumstances, when a similar case arose in connection with the addition of generic names to the "Official List of Generic Names." He (the Acting President) therefore recommended that the Commission should now place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" all three of the trivial names which he

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
8th Meeting,
Conclusion 6)

had mentioned but that in so doing, they should add a note, in the case of the name *esperi* Kirby, 1871, that this name was added to the "List," because it was both an available name and the name of the nominal species that was the type species of the genus *Euchloë* Hübner and that the addition of this name to the "Official List" did not prejudice the priority of the trivial names *creusa* Doubleday, [1847], or *orientalis* Bremer, 1864, from the standpoint of specialists who considered *esperi* Kirby to be congeneric with either of the insects referred to above. In the case of *orientalis* Bremer, a similar note should be added to make it clear that the entry of this name on the "Official List" did not prejudice the priority of the trivial name *creusa* Doubleday [1847]; from the standpoint of those specialists who regarded *orientalis* Bremer and *creusa* Doubleday as conspecific.

As regards the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, it must be noted that that trivial name (*icarus* Rottemburg, 1775, as published in the binominal combination *Papilio icarus*) was a homonym of the trivial name *icarus* Cramer 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio icarus*), which applied to an entirely different species, which was the type species of the genus *Castnia* Fabricius, 1807. Both these trivial names had been published in 1775 and there was no means at present by which to determine which should be regarded as having priority over the other. The Commission would recall that earlier during the present meeting they had considered this difficulty when they had placed the generic name *Castnia* Fabricius on the "Official List" and had come to the conclusion that the trivial name of the type species of that genus could not be placed on the "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology" until the Commission, acting under their plenary powers, had determined the relative priority to be assigned to the works in which these trivial names had respectively been published in 1775. As a preliminary to taking such a decision, the Commission had invited him (the Acting President) in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission to prepare a Report containing recommendations on this subject. In these circumstances, the Commission could only defer consideration of the question of the addition to the "Official List" of the type species of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille in the same way as they had deferred the corresponding question in regard to the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Castnia* Fabricius.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

- (1) to place the names of the undermentioned genera,

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
14th Meeting,
Conclusion 16)

with the type species severally specified below, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" :—

Name of genus (1)	Type species of genus specified in Col. (1) (2)
<i>Agriades</i> Hübner [1819]	<i>Papilio glandon</i> Prunner, 1798 (type species designated under the plenary powers)
<i>Carcharodus</i> Hübner [1819]	<i>Papilio alceae</i> Esper [1780] (type species designated under the plenary powers)
<i>Euchloë</i> Hübner [1819]	<i>Euchloë ausonia</i> Hübner var. <i>esperi</i> Kirby, 1871 (type species designated under the plenary powers)
<i>Lycaeides</i> Hübner [1819]	<i>Papilio argyrogynomon</i> Bergstrasser [1779] (identified as in Conclu- sion 23 above) (type species designated under the plenary powers)
<i>Polyommatus</i> Latreille, 1804	<i>Papilio icarus</i> Rottem- burg, 1775 (type species designated under the plenary powers)

(2) to place the undermentioned generic names on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" :—

Latiorina Tutt, 1909 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers : *Papilio glandon* Prunner, 1798)

Orpheides Hübner [1819] (type species, by designation under the plenary powers : *Papilio demodocus* Esper [1798])

Spilothyrus Duponchel, 1835 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers : *Papilio alceae* Esper [1870]) ;

(3) to take note that *argyrogynomon* Bergstrasser [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio argyrogynomon*), the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Lycaeides* Hübner, [1819], had already been placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" ;

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
14th Meeting,
Conclusion 23)

(4) (a) to take note that *icarus* Rottemburg, 1775 (as published in the binomial combination *Papilio icarus*), the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804, was published in the same year as *icarus* Cramer [1775] (as published in the binomial combination *Papilio icarus*), a trivial name which applied to an entirely different species, that the relative dates of publication of these trivial names was unknown, and that there existed no means of determining the relative dates of publication of volume 6 of the journal *Naturforscher* (in which the first of these trivial names was published) and volume 1 of Cramer's *Uitlandsche Kapellen* (in which the second of these trivial names was published) until, on the receipt of the Report on the relative priority which it was desirable should be assigned to these, and certain other, works published in the same year, which, at the meeting noted in the margin, the Commission had invited its Secretary to prepare for their consideration, the Commission put an end to the present state of confusion in this matter by using their plenary powers to determine the relative priority to be assigned to the works in question;

(b) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" whichever might, in the light of the Report referred to in (a) above, be found to be the oldest available trivial name for the type species of the genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804.

(5) to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" the undermentioned trivial names, being the trivial names of the type species of the genera, the names of which had been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" under (1) above, other than the names specified in (3) and (4) above, or, in the case of the generic name *Euchloë* Hübner [1819], the trivial names of earlier published nominal species regarded by certain specialists as being conspecific with the type species of that genus:—

alceae Esper [1780] (as published in the binomial combination *Papilio alceae*):
creusa Doubleday [1847] (as published in the

(Previous reference:
 Paris Session,
 14th Meeting,
 Conclusion 16(8))

binomial combination *Anthocharis creusa*); *esperi* Kirby, [1871] (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Euchlaë ausonia* Hübner var. *esperi*) (without prejudice to the prior rights of the trivial names *creusa* Doubleday, 1847, and *orientalis* Bremer, 1864, from the standpoint of specialists who regard either of these as the names of subspecies of the same collective species as *esperi* Kirby, 1871);

glandon Prunner, 1798 (as published in the binomial combination *Papilio glandon*); *orientalis* Bremer, 1864 (as published as a subspecific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Anthocharis belemida* Hübner var. *orientalis*) (for those specialists for whom this name is the oldest available name for the collective species of which, from their standpoint, *esperi* Kirby, 1871, is a subspecies) (but without prejudice to the prior rights of the trivial name *creusa* Doubleday from the standpoint of those specialists who consider *orientalis* Bremer and *creusa* Doubleday to be conspecific);

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1), (2) and (5) above.

The "Hildesheim List, [1839]", suppression of, for nomenclatorial purposes, under the plenary powers

25. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)196, containing an application submitted by Dr. H. Engel (Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes an anonymous and undated pamphlet of 20 quarto pages believed to have been published in 1839 and bearing the title *Verzeichniss einer aus Java übersandten sehr ansehnlichen Sammlung von Thieren aller Classen und einigen botanischen Gegenständen, welche bei dem Post-Spediteur und Senator Holzapfel in Stolzenau zum Verkauf ausstehen. Hildesheim.* This pamphlet, which, on the analogy of the "Erlangen List," suppressed by the Commission in 1935, might be called the "Hildesheim List," had been entirely unknown, until in 1940 or 1941 a unique copy, formerly in the Provincial Library at Leeuwarden, came to light. From the standpoint of stability in nomenclature, this pamphlet was extremely dangerous, for it contained new specific names (with accompanying Latin diagnoses) for one species of mammal and 18 species of birds. In order to prevent the chaos which might be expected to result if these unknown names were now to be substituted for the names currently used for the Javanese

species concerned, Dr. Engel recommended that the Commission should at once use their plenary powers to suppress this pamphlet for nomenclatorial purposes.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that Dr. Engel was to be congratulated on having taken such prompt action to bring this pamphlet to the attention of the Commission, thereby making it possible to secure its suppression under the plenary powers before confusion and instability was introduced into nomenclature by the adoption of the numerous new names which it contained. The proposal submitted by Dr. Engel had been advertised but, as was only to be expected, no specialist had come forward in opposition to the action proposed.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it was most fortunate that through Dr. Engel's action it would be possible to prevent any harm being done through the discovery of this pamphlet. It was a thousand pities that equally prompt action could not have been taken to deal with two other unwanted discoveries (namely the discovery of Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification* (Order Diptera) and the "Erlangen List" (Order Hymenoptera)) before the introduction of the new names which they contained had had time to create chaos in the generic nomenclature of the two Orders concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes the anonymous and undated pamphlet bearing the title *Verzeichniss einer aus Java übersandten sehr ansehnlichen Sammlung von Thieren aller Classen und einigen botanischen Gegenständen, welche bei dem Post-Spediteur und Senator Holzapfel in Stolzenau zum Verkauf ausstehen. Hildesheim* (the so-called "Hildesheim List"), believed to have been published in 1839 ;
- (2) placed on record that, in view of the decision specified in (1) above, any name, the first publication of which was in the "Hildesheim List" ranks for purposes of the Law of Priority (Article 25) and of the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34 and 35) as from the date subsequent to the "Hildesheim List" on which it was first published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of Article 25 and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ; and that any such name which had never been subsequently published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of Article 25 possessed no status in zoological nomenclature ;

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 47)

(3) agreed to render an *Opinion* recording to decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Hübner (J.), [1806], "Tentamen :" (1) the valid names of the genera for certain of the species cited in, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" ; (2) procedure to be adopted for determining the valid generic names for the remaining species cited in

26. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that at this point he desired the Commission to take into consideration the question of the names to be used for the genera cited by Jacob Hübner in 1806 in the leaflet known as the *Tentamen*, having regard to the fact that *Opinion* 97 had ruled that the names there used for those genera were not available as from their appearance in that leaflet. This subject was dealt with in the Commission File Z.N.(S.)314, which he now invited the Commission to examine. It had to be admitted that the handling of this case in the past had been unfortunate, for, although an application to validate the *Tentamen* names under the plenary powers had been received before *Opinion* 97 had actually been published in October, 1926 (as could be seen from the note appended at the end of that *Opinion*), no action had ever been taken in regard to that application, apart from the publication of an announcement of its receipt. Moreover, none of the papers relating to that application had been included among the documents transferred to his (the Acting President's) custody on his election as Secretary to the Commission. On learning from Mr. N. D. Riley (British Museum (Natural History), London) in 1947 that Professor Wm. T. M. Forbes (Cornell University, Ithaca, U.S.A.) was interested in this matter, he had entered into correspondence with him about it. As a result Professor Forbes had furnished him with a copy of the petition referred to at the end of *Opinion* 97, from which it appeared that the date of the petition was 1926 and that its signatories had been "Wm. Schaus, August Busck, Carl Heinrich and others."

Continuing, the Acting President said that, as was inevitable, the situation had been gravely prejudiced from the standpoint of the supporters of the *Tentamen* names by the interval of over 20 years that had elapsed since they had submitted their application, for in the meantime specialists had taken *Opinion* 97 as constituting a final decision against the *Tentamen* names. Subject to certain possible exceptions among the generic names in the Sub-Order Heterocera, even those of the *Tentamen* names which, prior to the publication of *Opinion* 97, had enjoyed a certain currency had dropped out of use. Clearly, in these circumstances it could not be claimed for these names that there was any justification for the Commission now using their plenary powers to validate them, for such action, far from leading to greater uniformity, would in existing

conditions merely introduce a new source of confusion. Equally, however, it was desirable that an end should be put to the confusion caused by the *Tentamen* controversy of a generation ago by determining which were the oldest available names under the *Règles* for each of the genera recognised by Hübner in the *Tentamen* (i.e. which were the oldest available names of the genera to which were referable the species cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen*). During his visit to the United States at the end of 1947, he (the Acting President), while in Washington, had had the benefit of a full discussion of this problem with Professor Forbes and with Dr. J. G. Franclemont and Dr. W. D. Field (Smithsonian Institution). At this conference Professor Forbes had explained that all that he now sought was that the Commission should take action under their plenary powers to validate such of the *Tentamen* names for genera of the Sub-Order Heterocera as were still in general use but which were invalidly so used, either because those names under the *Règles* (i.e. as published on the first occasion subsequent to the *Tentamen*) properly applied to some other genus or because there existed older available names for the genera in question. The problem did not arise in the case of the Sub-Order Rhopalocera, for one *Tentamen* name only was employed to-day for a genus belonging to that Sub-Order and that as from a later date. He (the Acting President) had felt that there was force in the view advanced by Professor Forbes and he had accordingly suggested that, in so far as either he or any other specialist in the Sub-Order Heterocera desired to see the preservation of a *Tentamen* name, he or they should submit applications suitably documented, to the Commission for the use of the plenary powers in those cases. Professor Forbes had replied that (as was indeed the case) the generic nomenclature of the Sub-Order Heterocera was in such a state that extensive bibliographical investigations might well be required before it was possible to establish the action which would be needed in order to validate the *Tentamen* names in question. At this point Professor Forbes had reverted to certain discussions which he had had with Mr. N. D. Riley in 1928. For his part, Professor Forbes said, he would be satisfied with any selection of the *Tentamen* names which Mr. Riley might decide to place before the Commission. He (the Acting President) had then given an undertaking that any adequately documented proposal on this subject which might be received from any source would be laid before the Commission as soon as possible; in the meantime, he would himself, as a specialist in the Sub-Order Rhopalocera, prepare for the consideration of the Commission a proposal for the addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the names

of the genera properly applicable to the species of that Sub-Order cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen*; this proposal would be entirely non-controversial, for (as already noted) no *Tentamen* name was now in use in that Sub-Order, except one with priority from a later date. Very shortly after his return to London from the United States, he had sent (on 28th January, 1948) the promised paper in draft to Dr. Franelement, in order to make sure that that specialist had no objection of any kind to the action proposed. He (the Acting President) had not since then received any comments from Dr. Franelement, who, he therefore concluded, saw no objection to the action proposed.

In conclusion the Acting President recommended the Commission to place on the "Official List" the oldest available names for ten of the genera in the Sub-Order Rhopalocera dealt with in the present application (the names of the remaining three genera having already been placed on the "Official List"), thereby settling once and for all the generic names applicable under the *Règles* to the species of that Sub-Order cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen*. As regards the corresponding names of genera of the Sub-Order Heterocera, he recommended that the Commission should place on record their desire that the earliest available names for the genera in question should also be placed on the "Official List" with as little further delay as possible (thereby putting an end to discussion as to the names applicable under the *Règles* to the genera of which the species so cited by Hübner were severally the type species) and that they should add a further declaration stating their willingness to give sympathetic consideration to any application for the use of the plenary powers to validate any generic name in the Sub-Order Heterocera that had originally appeared in the *Tentamen*, where it could be shown that the name in question was in general use, that confusion would ensue if, under the *Règles*, the name in use had to be changed, but that such change was inevitable, unless the Commission, by using their plenary powers, rendered such a change unnecessary.

IN DISCUSSION the view was generally expressed that it was desirable to lay the ghost of this old controversy by placing on the "Official List" the names of the genera which, under the *Règles*, were properly applicable to the species cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen*, exceptions being made in favour of *Tentamen* names where it could be shown that otherwise confusion was to be expected. The proposals submitted by the Acting President were calculated to secure this end and should therefore be accepted.

THE COMMISSION :—

- (1) agreed to take steps with as little further delay as possible to eliminate doubts regarding the generic names properly applicable to the 102 species of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) for which new generic names would have been provided in the leaflet entitled the *Tentamen*, which had been distributed to correspondents by Jacob Hübner in 1806, if it had not been for the fact that the names which appeared in that leaflet had been ruled to be unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes under *Opinion 97*, which, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, was, after clarification, now to be incorporated in the Schedule to the *Règles* in which all such decisions were now to be recorded ;
- (2) agreed that the object specified in (1) above could best be secured by placing the generic names concerned on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" ;
- (3) took note :—
 - (a) that, so far as concerned the Sub-Order Rhopalocera, no generic names which had originally appeared in the *Tentamen* were now in use in the sense in which they had applied in that leaflet with the exception of one name which now ranked for priority from a later date, that there was no difference of opinion among specialists regarding the generic names which, under the *Règles*, were properly applicable to the genera in question, and therefore that the way was now clear for placing on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" the names of the 13 genera in question, in so far as this had not already been done ;
 - (b) that, as regards the Sub-Order Heterocera, the present state of knowledge regarding the literature was not sufficient to make it possible, without further investigation by specialists, to determine what were the generic names properly applicable under the *Règles* to the species of that Sub-Order cited by Hübner in the *Tentamen* under generic names which, for the reason specified in (1) above were not available under the *Règles* as from the date of their appearance in that

leaflet, and that, in consequence it was not at present possible to determine what were the generic names in this Sub-Order which should be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(4) took note:—

(a) that, of the names of the 13 genera referred to in (3)(a) above, the following three names had already been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

Apatura Fabricius, 1807 (the equivalent of *Potamis* of the *Tentamen*)

Argynnis Fabricius, 1807 (the equivalent of *Dryas* of the *Tentamen*)

Mechanitis Fabricius, 1807 (the equivalent of *Nereis* of the *Tentamen*)

(b) that the names of the remaining ten genera referred to in (3)(a) above, with their *Tentamen* equivalents, were as follows:—

Name of Genus “ *Tentamen* ” equivalent
of generic name
cited in Col (1)

(1)

(2)

Aulocera Butler. *Oreas*

1867

(*Satyrus brahminus* Blanchard, 1844, (the type species of *Aulocera* Butler) being subjectively congeneric with *Papilio proserpina* [Schiffermüller and Denis], 1775, which would have been the type species of *Oreas* of the *Tentamen*, if that had been an available name)

Consul Hübner,
[1807]

Consult

(which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as the later name *Consul* Hübner [1807])

<i>Danaus</i> Kluk,	<i>Limnas</i>
1802	(<i>Papilio plexippus</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (the type species of <i>Danaus</i> Kluk) being subjectively congeneric with <i>Papilio chrysippus</i> Linnaeus, 1758, which would have been the type species of <i>Limnas</i> of the <i>Tentamen</i> , if that had been an available name)
<i>Euphydryas</i>	<i>Lemonias</i>
Scudder, 1872	(<i>Papilio phaeton</i> Drury [1773] (the type species of <i>Euphydryas</i> Scudder) being subjectively congeneric with <i>Papilio maturna</i> Linnaeus, 1758, which would have been the type species of <i>Lemonias</i> of the <i>Tentamen</i> , if that had been an available name)
<i>Limenitis</i>	<i>Najas</i>
Fabricius, 1807	(which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as <i>Limenitis</i> Fabricius)
<i>Nymphalis</i>	<i>Hamadryas</i>
Kluk, 1802	(<i>Papilio polychloros</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (the type species of <i>Nymphalis</i> Kluk) being subjectively congeneric with <i>Papilio io</i> Linnaeus, 1758, which would have been the type species of <i>Hamadryas</i> of the <i>Tentamen</i> , if that had been an available name)
<i>Papilio</i>	<i>Princeps</i>
Linnaeus, 1758	(which, if it had been an available name,

would have had the same type species as *Papilio* Linnaeus)

Pieris Schrank,
1801

Mancipium

(which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as *Pieris* Schrank)

Plebejus Kluk,
1802

Rusticus

(which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as *Plebejus* Kluk)

Pyrgus Hübner,
[1819]

Urbanus

(which, if it had been an available name, would have had the same type species as *Pyrgus* Hübner)

(5) agreed to place the undermentioned generic names, with the type species severally specified below, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

<i>Name of genus</i>	<i>Type species of genus specified in Col. (1)</i>
(1)	(2)
<i>Aulocera</i> Butler, 1867	<i>Satyrus brahminus</i> Blan- chard, 1844 (type species designated by Butler, 1867)
<i>Consul</i> Hübner [1807]	<i>Papilio fabius</i> Cramer [1776] (type species by monotypy)
<i>Danaus</i> Kluk, 1802	<i>Papilio plexippus</i> Lin- naeus, 1758 (type species selected by Hemming, 1933)
<i>Euphydryas</i> Scud- der, 1872	<i>Papilio phaeton</i> Drury [1773] (type species designated by Scudder, 1872)
<i>Limenitis</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>Papilio populi</i> Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selec- ted by Dalman, 1816)

Nymphalis Kluk, 1802 *Papilio polychloros* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Hemming, 1933)

Papilio Linnaeus, 1758 *Papilio machaon* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Latreille, 1810)

Pieris Schrank, 1801 *Papilio brassicae* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species selected by Latreille, 1810)

Plebejus Kluk, 1802 *Papilio argus* Linnaeus, 1758, as identified in Conclusion 23 above (type species selected by Hemming, 1933)

Pyrgus Hübner [1819] *Papilio alveolus* Hübner, [1800-1803] [= *Papilio malvae* Linnaeus, 1758] (type species selected by Westwood, 1841);

(6) agreed to place on the "Official Index of Rejected and Generic Names in Zoology" the thirteen "Tentamon" names specified in (4) above;

(7) took note that the trivial names of the type species of the undermentioned genera, the names of which had been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" under (5) above, had already been placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

Danaus Kluk, 1802 (type species: *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758)

Plebejus Kluk, 1802 (type species: *Papilio argus* Linnaeus, 1758);

(8) agreed to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" the undermentioned names, being the names of the type species of the genera placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" under (5) above, other than the genera specified in (6) above, save that in the case of the type species of the genus *Pyrgus* Hübner [1819], the trivial name now placed on the "Official List" is not the trivial name of the type species of that genus but is the trivial name of the nominal species subjectively identified with that species which has the oldest available trivial name:—

brahminus Blanchard, 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Satyrus brahminus*)
brassicae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio brassicae*)
fabius Cramer [1776] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio fabius*)
machaon Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio machaon*)
malvae Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio malvae*), as identified in (5) above
phaeton Drury [1773] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio phaeton*)
polychloros Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio polychloros*)
populi Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio populi*);

(9) with reference to (1), (2) and (3) (b) above, agreed to invite the Secretary to confer with specialists in the Sub-Order Heterocera and to submit proposals as soon as possible for the addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the names applicable to the genera for which names would have been provided as from 1806 in Hübner's *Tentamen*, if the names introduced in that leaflet had been available under the *Règles*, and, with reference to that request, to place on record their readiness to use their plenary powers to validate, as from the *Tentamen*, 1806, the name for any of the genera in question where it could be shown to their satisfaction (i) that the name in question was in general use for the genus concerned, (ii) that it was nevertheless not the oldest available name for the genus concerned, but (iii) that confusion would ensue unless the Commission used their plenary powers to validate the name in question as from the foregoing date;

(10) agreed to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions relating to generic and specific trivial names in the Sub-Order Rhopalocera of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) specified in (5) and (7) above, and, as regards the corresponding names in the Sub-Order Heterocera of the foregoing Order, to invite the Secretary to the Commission to bring to the urgent attention of specialists in that Sub-Order the conclusions recorded in (1), (2) and (3) (b) above and the request recorded in (8) above.

**"Papilio
podalirius"
Linnaeus, 1758
(Class Insecta,
Order Lepidoptera):
identity of,
determined under
the plenary powers**

27. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)183, containing an application submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to determine the identity of the species bearing the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio podalirius*). After observing that, although this species was usually treated as having been first described by Linnaeus in the 12th edition of the *Systema Naturae*, it had, in fact, first been named in a footnote on page 463 of the 10th edition, Dr. Corbet had pointed out (i) that the bibliographical references there cited by Linnaeus included only one (Ray) in which a locality ("prope Liburnum portum in Etruria") had been given, but (ii) that Linnaeus had himself given the locality "Habitat in Europae australis et Africae Brassica." The locality "Europa australis" was appropriate to the species to which the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus was universally applied, but, according to current systematic ideas, the locality "Africa" (i.e. Palaearctic North Africa) was not, for the insect which occurred there (i.e. the insect, the oldest available trivial name for which was *feisthameli* Duponchel, 1832), which had formerly been regarded as a subspecies of *Iphiclus podalirius* (Linnaeus) was now regarded as being specifically distinct therefrom. The difficulty in the present case, Dr. Corbet had explained, arose from the fact that the Linnean collection (now in the possession of the Linnean Society of London) contained a specimen of the North African *feisthameli* Duponchel which bore a label "*podalirius*" in Linnaeus' own handwriting. Dr. Corbet had had no doubt that this specimen should be regarded as Linnaeus' "type" of the species which he had named *Papilio podalirius*. For the reasons explained, great confusion would arise if it were necessary to transfer the trivial name *podalirius* from the well-known European species to which it had always been applied to the North African insect, which had always been known by the name *feisthameli* ever since, in 1832, it had been distinguished by Duponchel as (subspecifically) distinct from *podalirius* Linnaeus. Dr. Corbet had accordingly asked the Commission to prevent such confusion from arising by using their plenary powers to determine the European species (as contrasted with the North African species) as the species to which the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758, should be held to apply. He had suggested that this end should be secured by the Commission selecting from the bibliographical references cited by Linnaeus for *Papilio podalirius* the reference to Ray, a decision which,

by making Livorno in Italy the type locality of this species, would eliminate all doubt as to its identity.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the danger of confusion to which Dr. Corbet had drawn attention was serious and would remain so, until, by using their plenary powers, the Commission made it clear how the *Règles* were to be applied. As a lepidopterist, he (the Acting President) was confident that action on the lines recommended by the late Dr. Corbet would be warmly welcomed by all interested specialists. This application had been advertised, but, as in the circumstances was to be expected, that advertisement had elicited no adverse comment from any source. The Acting President pointed out that the means by which the late Dr. Corbet had suggested that the Commission should attain the end desired was particularly happily chosen, for its adoption would not only determine beyond possibility of question the species to which the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758, should be applied, but would also serve to designate precisely the type locality of that insect (i.e. the type locality of the nominotypical subspecies of *Papilio podalirius* Linnaeus), a matter of some importance, in view of the fact that several European subspecies of this species had later been distinguished. The Acting President added that, in accordance with the excellent maxim adopted by the Commission on the advice of Alternate Commissioner Beltrán, when they had been considering the principles governing the admission of generic names to the "Official List," it would be well if, when the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus was added to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names," the trivial name *feisthameli* Duponchel were also to be so added.

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) supported the proposal submitted by the late Dr. Corbet. This case was well-known to him and there was not the slightest doubt that serious confusion would arise if the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus were to be transferred to the North African insect now known by the trivial name *feisthameli* Duponchel, a transfer which, however, appeared inevitable, unless the Commission used their plenary powers in the sense proposed.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

- (1) to use their plenary powers to direct that the reference to "Raj. ins. m. n. 3" (i.e. Ray (J), 1710, *Hist. Ins.*: 111 n. 3) cited by Linnaeus, when in 1758 he first published the name *Papilio*

podalirius, was to be treated as representing the type specimen of that species and therefore that the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination cited above) was to be applied to the species there described by Ray from specimens taken at Livorno in Tuscany ("prope Liburnum, portum Etruriae");

(2) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—

podalirius Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio podalirius*), as defined in (1) above;

feisthameli Duponchel, 1832 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio feisthameli*) (without prejudice to the prior rights of the trivial name *podalirius* Linnaeus, 1758, from the standpoint of specialists who regard these as the names of subspecies of a single collective species);

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Article 31 (need for elaboration of, to cover certain special cases):
Secretary invited to prepare a comprehensive Report on

28. THE COMMISSION examined the undermentioned Commission Files containing proposals for the elaboration of the provisions in Article 31 in relation to the designation of holotypes and the selection of lectotypes submitted respectively by Dr. W. J. Arkell (then of the University Museum, Oxford) and Dr. H. E. Hinton (British Museum (Natural History), London):—

(a) File Z.N.(S.)179, containing a request received from Dr. Arkell for a ruling on the question of the procedure which an author should adopt when selecting a lectotype of a previously named species in cases where the author of the specific name had given both a description or figures of specimens and also bibliographical references to previously published descriptions or figures and, in publishing the name, had given an indication, such as the use of the expression "*nom. nov.*" (or an equivalent expression) or the selection as the basis for the new trivial name either of the personal name of the author to whose work a reference had been given, or of the name of the type locality of the species, which implied that the species thus given a new name was more closely linked to the material to which

the cited bibliographical reference applied than to the new material before the author at the time when he published the new name;

(b) File Z.N.(S.)180, containing a request received from Dr. Hinton as to the species to which a trivial name should adhere, if, when first published, it was applied both to certain material there described and also to a previously published nominal species, the name of which required to be replaced by reason of its being an invalid homonym, in a case where later examination shows that the author of the new trivial name was in error in identifying the material which he described with the species which required a new trivial name.

Dr. Arkell had illustrated the problem which he had submitted by referring to certain names published in 1938 by M. V. Maire for new species of the Order Ammonoidea (Class Cephalopoda). Dr. Arkell took the view that, where a new specific name was based partly upon a previously published description and partly upon additional material, the latter should be excluded from consideration when a lectotype is selected by a later author in every case where the author of the new name applies to it the expression "*nom. nov.*" (or an equivalent expression such as "*nom. mut.*"). Dr. Arkell further suggested that a *Recommandation* should be added to the *Règles* urging that in cases such as those referred to above authors, when selecting a lectotype for a nominal species, should give preference to the specimen described by a previous author even where the expression "*nom. nov.*" (or equivalent expression) was not used, in cases where the trivial name of the new species was based either upon the personal name of the previous author whose work was so cited, or upon the name of the type locality specified by the previous author. Dr. Arkell had realised that cases would arise where an author would be faced with the need to give a new name to a species already described or figured in the literature under a wrong name but where that description or figure was much less satisfactory than that which, with the help of additional material, the later author was in a position to give. To meet this type of case, Dr. Arkell suggested that a further *Recommandation* should be added to the *Règles* urging authors in such cases to describe the species as a new species and to avoid taking the name of the earlier author or of the type locality cited by that author as the basis for the new trivial name.

The application submitted by Dr. Hinton arose out of the circumstances in which in 1856 the specific name *Ptinus tectorius* (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) had been published

by Boieldieu. Boieldieu had published that name with a description of a Tasmanian insect but had explained that he regarded that insect as the same as that already named *Ptinus pilosus* White [1846], a name which, however, could not be used for this species, since it was an invalid homonym of *Ptinus pilosus* Müller, 1821; he (Boieldieu) accordingly renamed White's *pilosus* giving it the name *Ptinus tectus*. Dr. Hinton went on to explain that, while the description of the Tasmanian insect clearly applied to a true *Ptinus*, the species which White had named *Ptinus pilosus* was (as Blair (1928) had shown) not a Ptinid at all but an Anobiid. The question was to which of these totally different species did the name *Ptinus tectus* Boieldieu properly belong under the *Règles*. Dr. Hinton considered that the correct view to take was that on the same page Boieldieu had given the same name (*Ptinus tectus*) independently to two different species, that the relative priority to be assigned to those two names should be determined by reference to the position on the page on which they respectively occurred, and therefore that, as the name *Ptinus tectus* had been applied by Boieldieu to the Tasmanian species higher on the page than the place where he had stated that the name was a *nom. nov.* for *Ptinus pilosus* White, the name *Ptinus tectus* Boieldieu applied to the Tasmanian species, the same name given as a *nom. nov.* to White's *pilosus* being invalid as a junior primary homonym.

It was pointed out in discussion that, although the cases submitted by Dr. Arkell and Dr. Hinton respectively were not strictly identical with one another, they had one feature in common, in that they were both concerned with the identification (through the selection of a lectotype or otherwise) of the species (or the specimen) to which a given specific name should adhere when that name was based partly upon material before the author at the time when he drew up the description of the new species and partly upon a previously published description or figure, the new name being expressly designated by its author as a "*nom. nov.*" The approach to this problem by these specialists was noticeably different, Dr. Arkell considering that in such a case the material of the earlier author cited in the original description of the later published nominal species should alone be eligible for selection as the lectotype of the latter species, the material actually before the later author being ruled out for this purpose, while Dr. Hinton considered that, where the author of a name applied that name both to the material before him and also as the *nom. nov.* for a previously published species and it was later found that the former was not conspecific with the latter, the question as to which of

the species concerned should be the species to which the new name should adhere should be settled in accordance with the principle of *page*, and, if necessary, line precedence. This difference in outlook suggested that before a decision was taken on these questions, it would be desirable to obtain information regarding the general practice in cases of this kind and on the general wishes of zoologists in this matter. It was felt therefore that as a preliminary to the consideration of these cases, the Secretary to the Commission should be asked to confer with interested specialists in different groups of the Animal Kingdom and in the light of the information so obtained to submit a full Report, with recommendations, for the consideration of the Commission at their meeting to be held at Copenhagen in 1953 during the next (XIVth) meeting of the International Congress of Zoology.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the problems arising under Article 31 in relation to the identity of the species to which a given specific name applied, where that name was based partly upon specimens and partly upon a description previously published for a nominal species, the name of which or, as the case might be, the name applied to which by a previous author was rejected by the author of the new name, either because the name so used by the previous author was an unavailable name or because, when originally published, it had been applied to some other species.

Meuschen's Index to Gronovius, 1763-1781, "Zoophylacium Gronovianum": rejection or, for nomenclatorial purposes

29. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)311, containing, *inter alia*, an application submitted by Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) asking the Commission to give a ruling that the names published by Meuschen (F. C.) in the index to Gronovius' *Zoophylacium Gronovianum*, 1763-1781, were not available under the *Règles*, that author on that occasion not having applied the principles of binomial nomenclature as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that his work as a lepidopterist had led him before the outbreak of war in 1939 to examine carefully the index prepared by Meuschen to the non-binominal work, *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* of Gronovius, for the purpose of ascertaining whether that index contained any triv names for species of butterflies of which account should

taken. That examination had shown clearly that, while in this index Meuschen had applied the principles of "binary" nomenclature in the sense in which that expression was then commonly used (i.e. he had recognised that the name of an animal should be constructed in such a way as to recognise two concepts, that of the genus and that of the species included in the genus) but that he had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature, although many of the names there applied to species (in addition to the generic name) consisted of single words. This was the result mainly of the fact that in the great majority of cases these names consisted of univerbal trivial names copied by Meuschen from the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus. In these circumstances, he had put this matter on one side, considering that no definite decision regarding the availability of new names in Meuschen's index could be reached until, at its next meeting the International Congress of Zoology reached a final decision on the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" (as used in the *Règles*) in the light of the comprehensive Report which at Lisbon it had been agreed should be prepared by the Commission for consideration at the XIIIth International Congress. All doubts as to the meaning to be attached to Proviso (b) to Article 25 (where the expression "nomenclature binaire" had hitherto figured) had been removed by the decisions taken during the present Session to recommend that the expression "nomenclature binominale" should be substituted for the expression "nomenclature binaire" and that the expression "principes de la nomenclature binominale" should be clarified. These recommendations had been approved by the Section on Nomenclature and on the following morning would be submitted to the Congress for final approval in *Concilium Plenum*. As the result of these decisions, a name was only to be accepted as available under Article 25 if throughout the work in which it was published the author of the name consistently applied the principles of binominal nomenclature. Meuschen in his index to Gronovius' *Zoophylacium Gronovianum* had certainly not consistently applied these principles, as could readily be seen from the photostat in the file of a portion of the index made from the copy in the British Museum that had been kindly furnished by Mr. N. D. Riley. Accordingly, no new names that figured in Meuschen's index possessed any availability under the *Règles* as from the date of being so published. He (the Acting President) accordingly invited the Commission to give a decision in this sense. The Acting President added that a decision on this question

(Previous reference:
Lisbon Session,
5th Meeting,
Conclusion 3)

(Previous references:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 3;
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 67)

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
14th Meeting,
Conclusion 53)

was needed as a preliminary to the correction of the errors in Opinion 13 (relating to the trivial name of the Sand Crab), proposals in regard to which would be brought before the Commission later during the present meeting and in connection with which the status of Meuschen's Index to the *Zoophylacium* had recently been raised by Dr. Fenner A. Chace, Jr. (U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.).

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it was very desirable that rulings should be given by the Commission in regard to the availability of names published in little known (and, as in the present case, scarce) books by old writers of questionable binomial standing, in order to give a guide to systematists as to which of these works were to be accepted and which ignored.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

- (1) that in his index to Gronovius, 1763-1781, *Zoophylacium Gronovianum*, Meuschen (F.C.) had not consistently applied the principles of binomial nomenclature, as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25;
- (2) that, in view of (1) above, no new name published in the foregoing index prepared by Meuschen possessed any availability under the *Règles* in virtue of having been so published;
- (3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

“*Podura*”
Linnaeus, 1758,
and “*Tomoceros*”
Nicolet, 1842 (Class
Insecta, Order
Collembola):
designation of
type species of,
under the plenary
powers; “*Podura*”
Linnaeus, 1758,
correction in
“Official List of
Generic Names in
Zoology” of entry
relating to

30. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)199, containing the undermentioned applications for the use of the plenary powers for the purpose of designating *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, in place of the unrecognisable nominal species *Podura plumbea* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Collembola):—

- (a) an application submitted by M. Hermann Gisin (Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Geneva);
- (b) an application submitted by Dr. Jirí Paelt (National Museum, Prague, Czechoslovakia).

In his application M. Gisin had explained that the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, was *Podura plumbea* Linnaeus, 1758, that species having been so selected by Latreille (1810). The Commission itself had accepted this species as the type species of this genus when (in Opinion 104) they had placed the generic name *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, on the “Official List.” Unfortunately, however, it was not possible definitely to identify the

species to which Linnaeus had applied the name *Podura plumbea*, but it was clear that it was some species of the genus now known as *Tomocerus* Nicolet, 1842, of which, indeed, this nominal species was one of the originally included species. On the other hand, the name *Podura* Linnaeus was very well known as the name of the monotypical genus containing the species *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758. An enormous literature had grown up around the generic name *Podura* as used in this sense, and great confusion would be caused if it were necessary not only to abandon the use of the name *Podura* Linnaeus for the species *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, but also, in future, to use that generic name in an entirely different sense, that is, as the name of the genus now known as *Tomoceros* Nicolet. For over 100 years every worker in the group, except Börner (1901) (who had subsequently recanted), had used the generic name *Podura* Linnaeus for *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus. It was the object of the present application to validate the universal practice of specialists in this matter. As regards the genus *Tomoceros* Nicolet, both the originally included nominal species were unrecognisable. Thus, if, as was highly desirable, the position of this generic name was to be regularised, it would not be possible to designate either of the originally included species to be its type species. M. Gisin suggested that the desired end should be secured by the designation, under the plenary powers, of *Macrotoma minor* Lubbock, 1862, as the type species of this genus, this being a well-established species which specialists were agreed was referable to this genus.

The application received from Dr. Paclt (which was concerned only with the name *Podura* Linnaeus) followed the same lines as that submitted by M. Gisin, Dr. Paclt expressing the view that a state of confusion would be created if it were necessary to accept the unrecognisable nominal species *Podura plumbea* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758, and recommending that the Commission should therefore use their plenary powers to designate *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, when, in the process of preparing the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" for publication in book form, he, as Secretary to the Commission, had examined the *Opinions* under which the "Official List" had been built up, he had discovered that (in *Opinion 104*) the Commission had accepted the unrecognisable nominal species *Podura plumbea* Linnaeus, 1758, as

the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758. It was clearly useless to place on the "Official List" a generic name that was indeterminate, through being based upon an unrecognisable species. He had therefore intended himself to make a proposal to the Commission in regard to this generic name in order that, by the designation, under the plenary powers, of a recognisable species to be the type species of this well-known genus, the position of the name *Podura* Linnaeus might be regularised before the "Official List" was published. The receipt of M. Gisin's application had, however, rendered such action on his part unnecessary. The advertisement of this case, subsequent to the receipt of the applications submitted by M. Gisin and Dr. Paclt, had elicited strong support for the action proposed from Dr. Harlow B. Mills (Chief, State Natural History Survey Division, Department of Registration and Education, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.). Interest in this application had been shown also by Mr. J. T. Salmon (Dominion Museum, Wellington, New Zealand). Finally (in a letter to M. Gisin, communicated by the latter to the Commission) Dr. Maynard (University of Rochester, New York, U.S.A.) had also intimated his support for the present proposal.

IN DISCUSSION, it was agreed that there were excellent grounds for using the plenary powers to regularise the position of the well-known generic name *Podura* Linnaeus, and therefore that the present applications should be approved.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to set aside all selections of a type species for the undermentioned genera of the Order Collembola (Class Insecta), made prior to the present decision :—

(i) *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758

(ii) *Tomoceros* Nicolet, 1842 ;

(b) to designate the undermentioned species to be the type species of the genera specified in (1) above :—

(i) *Podura aquatica* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Podura* Linnaeus, 1758 ;

(ii) *Macrotoma minor* Lubbock, 1862, to be the type species of the genus *Tomoceros* Nicolet, 1842 ;

(2) to confirm the entry on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the generic name

Podura Linnaeus, 1758, subject to the substitution, as its type species, of the species specified in (1)(b)(i) above and of the insertion of a note that this species had been designated as the type species of this genus by the Commission under their plenary powers;

- (3) to place the generic name *Tomoceros* Nicolet, 1842 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers: *Macrotoma minor* Lubbock, 1862) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";
- (4) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology":—
aquatica Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binomial combination *Podura aquatica*)
minor Lubbock, 1862 (as published in the binomial combination *Macrotoma minor*);
- (5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

"*Amplypterus*"
Hübner, [1819]
(Class Insecta,
Order Lepidoptera);
determination of
type species of

31. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)204, containing an application from Senhor José Oiticica Filho (Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), asking for a ruling on the question of the type species of the genus *Amplypterus* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), with special reference to the question of principle raised in this case. Senhor Oiticica had drawn attention to a passage in a paper (1865) in which Grote, commenting on Hübner's treatment of this genus at the time that he established it, remarked that it contained "discordant material, while *A. ganascus* is regarded evidently as the typical species of his genus by Hübner." Was this sentence, Senhor Oiticica asked, to be regarded as a selection by Grote of the foregoing species as the type species of this genus? Senhor Oiticica had compared Grote's action with that of Crotch who in a paper on the type species of Sphingid genera had on several occasions referred first to one author as having selected a type species for a given genus and then to another as also having selected a type species for the same genus. Crotch's action had been rejected by subsequent authors as not constituting a selection of the type species of the genera in question within the meaning of Rule (g) in Article 30. Senhor Oiticica concurred in this view and considered also that the action by Grote in the passage quoted above should be similarly rejected, on the ground that there was no clear

indication in that passage as to whether Grote himself regarded *ganascus* Stoll as the type species of the genus *Amplypterus*.

In discussion it was pointed out that, as the wording of Rule (g) in Article 30 had stood at the opening of the present Session, it had undoubtedly been too restrictive in character, for the then existing wording was such as to exclude from the scope of that Rule the very numerous cases where the currently accepted type selection rested upon a statement by a given author either (1) that a given previous author had selected a certain species to be the type species of the genus concerned in cases where no such previous selection had been made or (2) in the case of the older authors, that such and such a species was the type species of the genus in question as the result of the action of previous authors in "eliminating" from the genus the other originally included species. To meet cases of this kind the Commission had, during their present Session, agreed upon a liberalisation of the provisions of Rule (g). In so doing, they had agreed that while the revised wording should be such as to bring within the scope of the Rule cases where an author clearly stated that a given nominal species was the type species of the genus concerned, even where that author expressly stated that he was not himself then selecting that species for this purpose, the Rule in its amended form should provide also that it should be a condition of the acceptance of such a statement as a valid type selection that the author should make it clear that he himself regarded (for whatever reason) the species in question as the type species of the genus under consideration. In these circumstances, it was now clear that Senhor Oiticica had interpreted Article 30 correctly when he had rejected Grote's action in 1865 as not complying with the requirements of Rule (g) in that Article. In view of the clarification of that Rule agreed upon during the present Session, no question of principle arose any longer in connection with the present application, for it was evident from the words used by Grote that, while he had there expressed an opinion regarding the view held by Hübner, he had given no indication regarding his own opinion on the question at issue.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 72)

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

- (1) that the statement by Grote (1865) that Hübner, when establishing the genus *Amplypterus* Hübner [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), had evidently regarded *A. ganascus* Stoll "as the typical species of his genus," did not constitute

the selection by Grote, under Rule (g) in Article 30, of that species as the type species of the foregoing genus, for he had given no indication that he (Grote) himself accepted the above species as the type species of that genus;

- (2) that, in view of (1) above, the type species of this genus was the species first subsequently so selected in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the foregoing Rule (i.e. *Sphinx panopus* Cramer [1779], so selected by Kirby (1892));
- (3) to place the generic name *Amplypterus* Hübner [1819] (type species by selection by Kirby, 1892: *Sphinx panopus* Cramer [1779]) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";
- (4) to place the trivial name *panopus* Cramer [1779] (as published in the binominal combination *Sphinx panopus* Cramer) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";
- (5) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (4) above.

**Phylum
Echinodermata :
eight applications
for the use of the
plenary powers to
validate accepted
nomenclatorial
usage submitted by
Commissioner Th.
Mortensen
(Denmark) :
preliminary
considerations
relating to**

32. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)18, containing an application submitted to the Commission by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to validate the current use of the undermentioned generic names in the Phylum Echinodermata, in order to avoid the confusion which the strict application of the *Règles* would cause:—

- (a) *Encriinus* Schultze, 1760: proposed validation with *Encriinus liliiformis* Lamarck, 1801, as type species;
- (b) *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844: proposed validation with *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828, as type species;
- (c) *Luidia* Forbes, 1839: proposed validation, consequent upon the suppression of *Bipinnaria* Sars, 1835;
- (d) *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816: proposed validation with *Spatagus pusillus* Müller (O. F.), 1776, and *Echinocyamus craniolaris* Leske, 1778, as respective type species;
- (e) *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835, and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835: proposed validation with *Cidarites (Phyllacanthus) dubia* Brandt, 1835, and *Echinus (Strongylocentrotus) chlorocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, as respective type species;

- (f) *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 ; *Ova* Gray, 1825 ; *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836] ; *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 ; *Moira* Agassiz, 1827 ; *Brissus* Gray, 1825 : proposed validation with the undermentioned species as respective type species : *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O. F.), 1776 ; *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck 1816 ; *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz, 1840 ; *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777 ; *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816 ; *Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor* Leske, 1778 ;
- (g) *Diadema* Gray, 1825 : proposed validation with *Echinometra setosa* Leske, 1778, as type species ;
- (h) *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen, 1869, and *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912 : proposed validation with *Lepidocentrus irregularis* Meek and Worthen, 1869, and *Oligoporus missouriensis* Jackson, 1896, as respective type species.

Prior to submitting the foregoing applications to the Commission, Commissioner Mortensen had consulted 38 leading specialists in the Class Echinoidea and had obtained their views on the action proposed to be recommended to the Commission. Dr. Mortensen had then embodied the results of these consultations in a paper entitled "A Vote on some Echinoderm Names" which was published in October, 1932 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (10) **10** : 354-368). The following is the list of specialists recorded as having taken part in the foregoing consultations :—

F. A. Bather (*British Museum, London*) ; A. G. Brighton (*Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge*) ; A. H. Clark (*U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.*) ; H. L. Clark (*Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) ; J. Cottreau (*Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*) ; E. D. Currie (*Hunterian Museum, Glasgow*) ; E. Deichmann (*Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) ; A. M. Diakonov (*Zoological Museum, Leningrad*) ; L. Döderlein (*Munich*) ; Sv. Ekman (*Zoological Institute, Uppsala*) ; A. Faas (*Geological Committee, Leningrad*) ; D. M. Fedotov (*Zoological Laboratory, Leningrad*) ; W. K. Fisher (*Hopkins Marine Station, Pacific Grove, California*) ; T. Gislén (*Zoological Institute, Uppsala*) ; Seitaro Goto (*Tokio*) ; J. W. Gregory (*Geological Department, University, Glasgow*) ; J. A. Grieg (*Zoological Museum, Bergen*) ; H. L. Hawkins (*Geological Department, University, Reading*) ; R. Hecker (*Geological Museum, Leningrad*) ; S. Heding (*Zoological Museum, Copenhagen*) ; E. Hérouard (*Laboratoire de Zoologie, La Sorbonne, Paris*) ; N. v. Hofsten (*Zoological Institute,*

Uppsala); R. T. Jackson (*Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*); F. Klinghardt (*Museum f. Naturkunde, Berlin*); J. Lambert (*Paris*); I. Lieberkind (*Zoological Museum, Copenhagen*); Aug. Nobre (*Zoological Institute, Porto, Portugal*); H. Ohshima (*Zoological Laboratory, Fukuoka, Japan*); A. Panning (*Zoological Museum, Hamburg*); A. Reichensperger (*Zoological Institute, Bonn*); I. P. J. Ravn (*Palaeontological Department, University, Copenhagen*); W. E. Schmidt (*Prussische Geolog. Landesanstalt, Berlin*); W. K. Spencer (*Ipswich, England*); G. Stefanini (*Geological Institute, Pisa*); Dom Aurélien Valette (*Saint-Léger-Vauban, France*); C. Vaney (*Laboratoire de Zoologie, Lyon*); J. Wanner (*Geological Institute, Bonn*); N. Yakovlev (*Geological Committee, Leningrad*).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the foregoing application had been received in November, 1932, but for various reasons it had not been found possible by his predecessor to make progress with any of these cases except that relating to the names *Luidia* Forbes and *Bipinnaria* Sars (case (c) above), on which proposals had been submitted for consideration by the Commission at their meeting held in Lisbon in September, 1935. At that meeting, the Commission had reached a decision on the foregoing case (a decision which had shortly afterwards been embodied in *Opinion 129*) and had held a preliminary discussion in regard to case (g) (*Diadema*) and case (d) (*Echinocyamus*). On the first of these cases, the Commission had invited Dr. Mortensen and himself (Commissioner Hemming) to confer together with a view to the submission of a fuller statement of the issues involved; case (d) had been postponed for further consideration. Continuing, the Acting President said that it had not been possible to carry further the consideration of these cases (except *Diadema* (case (g) above) on which a further statement prepared by Dr. Mortensen in consultation with himself had been submitted to the Commission) by the time when in 1939 the outbreak of war in Europe had first made it necessary temporarily to close down the Secretariat of the Commission and later, by the German occupation of Denmark, had made it impossible for him (the Acting President), as Secretary to the Commission, to communicate with Dr. Mortensen. Immediately after the close of the war, he had, however, written to Dr. Mortensen asking him to furnish concise statements, with full bibliographical data, in regard to each of the cases in question. In addition, he had visited Copenhagen in August, 1946, and had had an opportunity of a full discussion with Dr.

(Previous reference:
Lisbon Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusions 1-3)

Mortensen in regard to these cases. As a result, Dr. Mortensen had submitted supplementary statements in regard to cases (b) (*Archaeocidaris*), (d) (*Echinocyamus*), (e) (*Phyllacanthus*), and (f) (*Spatangus*). Dr. Mortensen had intimated, as regards case (a) (*Encrinus*), that he would prefer that the work on the remaining stages of this application should be undertaken by some Crinoid specialist, while, as regards case (h) (*Pholidocidaris*), he had stated that he regarded this case as of much less importance than the others which he had submitted and in the circumstances did not propose to continue with it. The position was therefore that out of the eight cases submitted by Dr. Mortensen in 1932, one (*Luidia*) had been settled at Lisbon in 1935, and another (*Diadema*) during the present Session, one (*Encrinus*) had been transferred by Dr. Mortensen to other hands, and one (*Pholidocidaris*) had been withdrawn. The files containing the four remaining cases should, he (the Acting President) suggested, now be examined by the Commission with a view to decisions being taken on the issues involved.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note :—

- (a) that a decision on the third of the applications submitted by Dr. Mortensen (Copenhagen) (relating to the names *Bipinnaria* Sars, 1835, and *Luidia* Forbes, 1839) (case (c)) had been taken at the Session held at Lisbon in 1935 and that the only action which now required to be taken was to place on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names" the trivial name *ciliaris* Philippi, 1837 (as published in the binominal combination *Asterias ciliaris*), that being the oldest available trivial name of a species subjectively identified by specialists with the species bearing the trivial name *fragilissima* Forbes, 1839 (as published in the binominal combination *Luidia fragilissima*), the type species of the genus *Luidia* Forbes, 1839, placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" in Opinion 129 rendered by the Commission in consequence of the decision referred to above ;
- (b) that a decision had already been reached during the present Session on the seventh of the applications submitted by Dr. Mortensen (relating to the name *Diadema* Gray, 1825) (case (g)) ;

(Previous reference:
Lisbon Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 2)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
13th Meeting,
Conclusion 27)

- (c) that Dr. Mortensen had suggested that the responsibility for the remaining stages of the first of the applications which he had submitted (relating to the name *Encrinus* Schultze, 1760) (case (a)) could more appropriately be undertaken by a specialist in Crinoids than by himself;
- (d) that Dr. Mortensen had intimated his desire to be permitted to withdraw the eighth of the applications which he had originally submitted, namely case (h) relating to the names *Pholidocidaris* Meek and Worthen, 1869, and *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912;
- (2) agreed, with reference to (1)(a) above, to place the trivial name *ciliaris* Philippi, 1837 (as published in the binominal combination *Asterias ciliaris*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";
- (3) invited the Secretary to the Commission, with reference to (1)(c) above, to arrange, in consultation with Dr. Mortensen, for a specialist in Crinoids to undertake responsibility for the remaining stages of the application relating to the name *Encrinus* Schultze, 1760, with a view to a decision being taken with as little further delay as possible either to use the plenary powers in this case or, alternatively, to place the foregoing generic name on the "Official List" in the sense in which it should be applied under the *Règles*;
- (4) agreed, with reference to (1)(d) above, that, having regard to the wide publicity which had been given to the proposal that the plenary power should be used in the case of the names *Pholidocidaris* Meek & Worthen, 1869, and *Lovenechinus* Jackson, 1912, it would not be appropriate to allow that application to lapse, the proper course in such a case being to place on the relevant "Official List" the names for which it had previously been proposed that the plenary powers should be used, the entries so made to be those prescribed under the *Règles*, and accordingly invited the Secretary to the Commission to confer with specialists for the purpose of securing the submission to the Commission of alternative proposals on the foregoing lines, if that was the general wish of interested specialists;

(5) agreed to examine, in turn, the undermentioned Commission Files relating to the four remaining applications (cases (b), (d), (e) and (f)) submitted by Dr. Mortensen, for the purpose of reaching decisions on the questions so submitted :—

- (a) Commission File Z.N.(S.)320, relating to case (b) (*Archaeocidaris*) ;
- (b) Commission File Z.N.(S.)318, relating to case (d) (*Echinocyamus*) ;
- (c) Commission File Z.N.(S.)319, relating to case (e) (*Phyllacanthus*) ;
- (d) Commission File Z.N.(S.)317, relating to case (f) (*Spatangus*).

“Echinocrinus” Agassiz, 1841 (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida), proposed suppression of, and “Archaeocidaris” M'Coy, 1844, proposed validation of, under the plenary powers : consideration postponed for additional information to be obtained

33. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)320, containing an application submitted by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of other specialists in the Class Echinoidea that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, and to validate the name *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844 (type species, by monotypy: *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828) (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida). Dr. Mortensen explained that the early history of these names was clearly stated in a paper entitled “*Echinocrinus* versus *Archaeocidaris*” published by the late Commissioner F.A. Bather (United Kingdom) in 1907 (*Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (7) **20** : 452–456) and treated as part of the present application. Briefly, what had happened was that Agassiz (1841) had established the genus *Echinocrinus* for four species, of which the first was *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828 ; no type species was designated by Agassiz for this genus. In 1844, M'Coy recognised the genus *Echinocrinus*, including in it *Cidaris urii* Fleming and other species. Of *Cidaris urii*, M'Coy said that he “had long ago distinguished this species in” his “MSS., under the name of *Archaeocidaris*.” By publishing this observation M'Coy had unwittingly established the genus *Archaeocidaris* with *Cidaris urii* Fleming as the type species by monotypy. Once the fact that these fossils were Echinoids unrelated to Crinoids had been recognised, specialists were attracted by the appropriateness of the name *Archaeocidaris* published, but rejected, by M'Coy, and various authors had adopted it in place of *Echinocrinus*, including ultimately (1849) M'Coy himself. Later, this name had been adopted by some authors as the basis of a family name. Great difference of opinion had existed among specialists for many years on the question of which of these generic names should be used for

the species originally described by Fleming as *Cidaris urii*. The late Commissioner Bather, in the paper referred to above, had rightly concluded that, under the *Règles*, *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, was an available name, and must therefore take precedence over *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844. That conclusion was reached, however, six years before the grant to the Commission of plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in certain cases and the fact that on this occasion Bather accepted *Echinocrinus* (though with reluctance) in preference to *Archaeocidaris* did not imply that he would have done so, if it had been possible at that time to seek the opposite solution by means of the plenary powers. This was clearly shown by the fact that many years later (1932) Commissioner Bather had joined with Dr. Mortensen in submitting the present application. This application had been one of the eight applications which had formed the subject of extensive preliminary consultation by Dr. Mortensen (as described in Conclusion 32 above). Of the 38 specialists then consulted, 35 had voted in favour of the submission of the present proposal to the Commission, while one (Lambert) had expressed the view that *Archaeocidaris* could be retained without resort to the plenary powers (i.e. that it was an available name under the *Règles*); only two of the specialists consulted (Gislén and von Hofsten) had withheld their vote, taking the view that, if this proposal were to be granted, it might lead to too many applications of a similar kind being brought forward. Dr. Mortensen strongly urged the adoption of the present proposal, arguing that it would be most unfortunate from every point of view if it were necessary to reject the highly appropriate name *Archaeocidaris* in favour of the absolutely misleading name *Echinocrinus*; such a change would be of no possible value to science and would be sure to lead to great confusion.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present application had been advertised, but that the advertisement had elicited no adverse comment on the action proposed.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that, although the application had clearly established that the name *Echinocrinus* was inappropriate and that from this point of view the name *Archaeocidaris* was to be preferred, no clear evidence had been advanced in support of the argument that actual confusion was likely to ensue if the *Règles* were allowed to take their course in this case and the availability of *Echinocrinus* Agassiz formally recognised. On the other hand attention was drawn to the statement at the conclusion of the late Commissioner Bather's paper (submitted by Dr.

Mortensen as part of his application) that already by 1907 the generic name *Archaeocidaris* had given its name to a family (ARCHAEOCIDARIDAE). It would be helpful if, before a decision were taken on this application, further information could be obtained on the nature and extent of the confusion to be expected if the name *Archaeocidaris* were now to be relegated as a synonym of *Echinocrinus*. An application supported by virtually the entire body of interested specialists in all parts of the world was not to be lightly placed on one side.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) that, before a decision was taken on the application submitted by Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of interested specialists that the Commission should use their plenary powers (a) to suppress the generic name *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, and (b) to validate the generic name *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844 (type species, by monotypy: *Cidaris urii* Fleming, 1828) (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida), it was desirable to obtain further information regarding the nature and extent of the confusion apprehended if in this case the *Règles* were permitted to take their course, *Echinocrinus* Agassiz, 1841, replacing the name *Archaeocidaris* M'Coy, 1844;
- (2) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to communicate the foregoing conclusion to Dr. Mortensen and, in consultation with him and other interested specialists, to prepare for the consideration of the Commission a Report setting out the views expressed by such specialists on the issue referred to in (1) above, in order that, in the light of the views so expressed, the Commission might reach a final decision on the foregoing application.

“ *Echinocamus* ”
van Phelsum, 1774,
and “ *Fibularia* ”
Lamarck, 1816
(Class Echinoidea,
Order
Clypeastroida) :
designation of
type species of,
under the plenary
powers

34. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)318, containing an application submitted by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of other specialists in the Class Echinoidea that the Commission should use their plenary powers to secure that the generic names *Echinocamus* van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816 (Class Echinoidea, Order Clypeastroida), should be used in their long-established sense, the former for species of the flat type, the latter for species of the high globose type.

Dr. Mortensen explained that, when van Phelsum first published the generic name *Echinocyamus*, he placed in the genus so named what he regarded as 14 different species, some of which he stated had been taken in the Adriatic, the remainder in America. These "species" had not been given Latin trivial names by van Phelsum, but these were supplied four years later by Leske (1778). The figures given by van Phelsum were very poor, but certain of them left no doubt in Dr. Mortensen's mind that the species figured were of the flat type, while the reference to some of these specimens having been taken in the Adriatic confirmed this view, for only the flat species, known as *Echinocyamus pusillus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, i.e. the species originally described as *Spatagus pusillus* by Müller, occurred in that area. Lamarck (1816) had not used the generic name *Echinocyamus* and had introduced a new name, *Fibularia*, in which he had placed three new nominal species, *trigona* (which was unrecognisable), *ovulum*, which was recognisable as a species of the high globose type and *tarentina*, which was another name for the flat type species known as *Echinocyamus pusillus*. The first author to recognise that the species of the flat type and those of the high globose type were generically distinct from one another was Agassiz (1841), who then applied the name *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum to the species of the flat type and *Fibularia* Lamarck to the species of the high globose type. Agassiz did not select type species for these genera, but from that time onwards until the publication of Lambert's paper in 1891, all specialists had proceeded on the assumption that *Echinocyamus pusillus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, was the type species of *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum and *Fibularia ovulum* Lamarck the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck. In 1891, however, Lambert had published a paper in which he claimed to have proved that the figures given by van Phelsum for species of his genus *Echinocyamus* were of specimens of the high globose type and therefore that the name *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum must in future be transferred from the species of the flat type to those of the high globose type till then referred to the genus *Fibularia* Lamarck. At the same time Lambert applied the name *Fibularia* Lamarck to the species of the flat type, thus causing a most confusing exchange of meaning as between these two well-known generic names. Lambert's conclusions had been challenged by the foremost authorities on fossil Echinoids, e.g. by Cottreau (1894) and de Loriol (1897) and also by Dr. Mortensen himself (1907, 1910), who had rejected Lambert's conclusions and, in so doing, had been joined by almost every other specialist concerned. Nevertheless Lambert had maintained his point of view and in 1914 in his "Essaide

nomenclature raisonnée des Echinides," written jointly with Thiéry, the names *Echinocyamus* and *Fibularia* were used in the transposed sense. When Dr. Mortensen had held the consultation with specialists on which the present application was founded, all but one of the 38 specialists in question (for whose names see Conclusion 32 above) had supported the submission of the present application to the Commission, the single opponent being Lambert himself. The application now before the Commission in its resubmitted form was identical in object with the original petition of 1932, but it differed from that petition in one point of detail. In 1932 the applicants had asked that the Commission should designate as the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck the species *Echinocyamus craniolaris* Leske, 1778, that name being then considered to be the oldest available name for the high globose species to which Lamarck had given the name *Fibularia ovulum*. It was now realised that this identification was incorrect, the species to which Leske had given the name *craniolaris* being not a species of the high type but the flat species which Müller (O.F.) in 1776 had named *Echinocyamus pusillus*. Accordingly, in the application, as resubmitted, the Commission were asked to designate *Fibularia ovulum* Lamarck as the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck, thereby securing that that generic name should be used for the species of the high globose type.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that the present case had been advertised but the advertisement had elicited no adverse comment on the action proposed.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that this was a case where confusion had arisen (or was calculated to arise) in the main not through the strict application of the *Règles* but through doubt as to how the *Règles* should be applied as the result of differences of opinion on the taxonomic question of the identity of the species included by van Phelsum in his genus *Echinocyamus*. In addition, however, there were strictly nomenclatorial issues involved, such as the doubt as to whether van Phelsum could properly be regarded as a binominal author (and therefore whether, without the use of the plenary powers, the name *Echinocyamus* had any standing as from van Phelsum, 1774) and the situation created by the selection by H. L. Clark (1914), as the type species of *Fibularia* Lamarck, of the species *Fibularia trigona* Lamarck, a species regarded by the present applicants as being unrecognisable. There was general agreement, however, that the plenary powers should be used in this case, in order to prevent the confusion which would inevitably follow the transfer of the name

Echinocyamus to the genus now known as *Fibularia* and of the name *Fibularia* to the genus now known as *Echinocyamus*.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to set aside all selections of type species for the undermentioned genera and to validate the generic names in question, with the species specified below as respective type species :—

Generic name validated	Species designated as the type species of the genus specified in Col. (1)
(1)	(2)
<i>Echinocyamus</i> van Phelsum, 1774.	<i>Echinocyamus pusillus</i> Müller (O.F.), 1776.
<i>Fibularia</i> Lamarck, 1816.	<i>Fibularia ovulum</i> Lamarck, 1816.

(2) to place on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" the generic names *Echinocyamus* van Phelsum, 1774, and *Fibularia* Lamarck, 1816, with the type species severally specified in (1) above ;

(3) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" :—

pusillus Müller (O.F.), 1776 (as published in the binomial combination *Echinocyamus pusillus*) ;
ovulum Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binomial combination *Fibularia ovulum*) ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

"*Phyllacanthus*"
 (Class Echinoidea,
 Order Cidaroida)
 and
 "*Strongylocentrotus*"
 (Class Echinoidea,
 Order
 Camerodonta)
 validated as of
 subgeneric status as
 from Brandt,
 1835, under the
 plenary powers

35. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)319, containing an application submitted by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of other specialists in the Class Echinoidea that the Commission should use their plenary powers to direct that the names *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835 (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida) and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835 (Class Echinoidea, Order Camerodonta) were to be treated as having been published by the above author as subgeneric names with *Cidarites* (*Phyllacanthus*) *dubius* Brandt, 1835, and *Echinus* (*Strongylocentrotus*) *chlorocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, as respective type species. Dr. Mortensen explained that the names *Phyllacanthus* and *Strongylocentrotus* were accepted by Agassiz and by all subsequent authors up to the year

1909. Both names, especially *Strongylocentrotus*, had in this way become widely known, not only in echinological literature, but also in biological literature generally. In 1909, however, Lambert and Thiéry had advanced the view that these names had not been published by Brandt as new subgeneric names, but as synonyms, respectively, of *Cidarites* Leske, 1778, and *Echinus* Linnaeus, 1758. On the basis of this conclusion, these authors had then proceeded to make a considerable number of consequential changes in the nomenclature of the group of which these genera formed part. The conclusions reached by Lambert and Thiéry in regard to Brandt's intentions when he published these two names were regarded as highly disputable by echinologist generally, by whom the changes in nomenclature suggested by Lambert and Thiéry had not been accepted. While in Dr. Mortensen's view, it was possible that these two names had, in fact, been looked upon by Brandt as synonyms (of *Cidarites* and *Echinus* respectively), the practical application of this conclusion would, in his opinion and in that of the large number of specialists associated with him in the present application, lead to great confusion and could not possibly be justified. The present application had been one of the eight applications on which Dr. Mortensen had consulted 38 leading specialists before (in 1932) he submitted his proposals to the Commission. Of these specialists (the names of whom have been given in Conclusion 32), 37 had voted in favour of the submission of the present proposals to the Commission, the sole exception being Lambert himself.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present case had been advertised but the advertisement had elicited no adverse comment on the action proposed. As regards the trivial name of the type species of the genus *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, the Acting President observed that that species was invariably known by the trivial name *drebachiensis* Müller (O.F.), 1776 (as published in the binomial combination *Echinus drebachiensis*) and that, in view of the fact that it was proposed in any case to use the plenary powers to validate the generic name *Strongylocentrotus*, and to designate its type species, it would be desirable at the same time to designate the foregoing nominal species to be the type species rather than the nominal species *Echinus (Strongylocentrotus) chlorocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, the name under which the taxonomic species concerned had been cited by Brandt, when he published the name *Strongylocentrotus*.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it would clearly be wrong to countenance the introduction of

extensive and confusing changes in the nomenclature of a group, on the strength solely of an argument which (as here) rested upon a subjective interpretation of the intention of a given author when publishing a given name, when (as here) that interpretation was contested by almost the entire body of interested specialists. In view of the doubts arising from the interpretation by Lambert and Thiéry of Brandt's intentions when he first published the names *Phyllacanthus* and *Strongylocentrotus*, it would be necessary for the Commission to use their plenary powers, in order to put an end to further discussion. It would be desirable, however, that, in this, as in previous similar cases, the Commission should use those powers conditionally and to such extent (if any) as might be necessary. In other words, the Commission should make it clear that in using those powers for the purpose of validating the foregoing names as of subgeneric status as from Brandt, 1835, they did so only if and in so far as this course was necessary to attain the desired end and that their action in this matter was not to be construed as expressing an opinion on the question whether (as alleged by Lambert and Thiéry) the names in question had been regarded by their original author, not as subgeneric names, but as synonyms of the generic names, with which these names had been severally associated by that author.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to such extent as might be necessary :—

(i) to validate the names *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835, and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835 (Class Echinoidea, Order Cidaroida) as of subgeneric status as from the date of being so published;

(ii) to designate *Cidarites* (*Phyllacanthus*) *dubius* Brandt, 1835, as the type species of *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835,

(b) to designate *Echinus drøbachiensis* Müller (O.F.), 1776, to be the type species of the genus *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835;

(2) to place on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" the names *Phyllacanthus* Brandt, 1835, and *Strongylocentrotus* Brandt, 1835, validated as in (1) above and with the type species there severally specified;

(3) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" :—

dubius Brandt, 1835 (as published in the binominal combination *Cidarites (Phyllacanthus) dubius*) ;

drøbachiensis Müller (O.F.), 1776, as published in the binominal combination *Echinus drøbachiensis*) ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" *Spatangus* " Gray, 1825, " *Ova* " Gray, 1825, " *Schizaster* " Agassiz, [1836], " *Echinocardium* " Gray, 1825, " *Moira* " Agassiz, 1872, and " *Brissus* " Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea, Order Spatangoidea) : validation of current nomenclatorial practice in regard to, under the plenary powers

36. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)317, containing an application submitted by Dr. (now Commissioner) Th. Mortensen (Denmark) on his own behalf and on that of a large group of other specialists in the Class Echinoidea that the Commission should use their plenary powers in various ways to validate existing nomenclatorial practice in regard to six associated generic names in the foregoing Class, where, if the *Règles* were to be strictly applied, serious disturbance and consequential confusion would inevitably ensue. The generic names in question were : *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 ; *Ova* Gray, 1825 ; *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836] ; *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 ; *Moira* Agassiz, 1827 ; *Brissus* Gray, 1825. The following is a summary of the principal points made by Dr. Mortensen in regard to each of the foregoing names :—

(1) *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 : This name had been used by the older authors (Klein, Leske) in a very wide sense under which it covered species now included in different families and even different Orders. Lamarck (1816) applied it to all the Spatangooids, of which, however, he cited only one by name, the new nominal species *Spatangus vulgaris* Lamarck (which had proved to be the same species as that now known as *Brissus carinatus*). If therefore Lamarck were treated as the author of the name *Spatangus*, that generic name would replace *Brissus* Gray and the species now known as *Brissus carinata* would have to be known as *Spatangus vulgaris* Lamarck. No one had, however, adopted this course. The true author of the generic name *Spatangus* in the modern sense was Gray (1825), who had placed in this genus only *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O. F.), 1776. So regarded, the genus *Spatangus* Gray was monotypical with the above species as its type species. It was in this sense that the generic name *Spatangus* had been used by all subsequent specialists until in 1902 Lambert had advanced the view that this name should be used not in the sense

in which it had been employed by Gray in 1825 but in the sense in which it had first been used by Klein; that on this basis this generic name was not applicable to the species *Spatagus purpureus* Müller, which accordingly Lambert placed in a new genus to which he applied the name *Prospatangus*. Dr. Mortensen agreed that Gray had used the name *Spatangus* in a sense different from that of Klein. It would, however, in Dr. Mortensen's view, create the greatest confusion to abandon the use of the name *Spatangus* for *purpureus* Müller and to apply that name, as suggested by Lambert, to *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816.

(2) *Ova* Gray, 1825: The type species of this genus by monotypy was *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816. Accordingly under Lambert's view *Ova* Gray was an objective synonym of *Spatangus* as interpreted by that author. Dr. Mortensen asked that, when the Commission validated the name *Spatangus* as from Gray, 1825, and in consequence validated the designation of *Spatagus purpureus* Müller as the type species of that genus, they should also confirm the availability of *Ova* Gray, 1825, with *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck as its type species.

(3) *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836]: The type species of this genus was the fossil species *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz, 1840. This genus had been accepted even by Lambert and Thiéry notwithstanding their views on the generic position of *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck (see (1) above), a species which had formerly been referred to the genus *Schizaster*.

(4) *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, and (5) *Moira* Agassiz, 1872: Gray had placed in the genus *Echinocardium* three species, of which the first was *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816. Agassiz, the next author to deal with this subject, rejected the name *Echinocardium* Gray, sinking it as a synonym of a new generic name of his own (*Amphidetus*). At the same time Agassiz transferred *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, to his new genus *Schizaster*, in which also (as shown in (3) above) he placed the new species *Schizaster studeri*. In their "Catalogue raisonné" Agassiz and Desors cited *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, as the first species of the genus *Amphidetus* Agassiz, 1836 (which, as noted above, Agassiz had previously adopted in place of the earlier name *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825). In a later paper ("Synopsis des Echinides fossiles") Desors accepted *Echinocardium* Gray (sinking *Amphidetus* Agassiz as a synonym), citing *Echinus cordatus* Pennant as the first species. In the meantime Michelin had established the genus *Moira* Michelin, 1855, based upon *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, which was accordingly treated by later authors as though it had been designated as the type species of the

genus *Moera* Michelin. Later it was found that this generic name was an invalid homonym, and Agassiz (1872) accordingly altered it to *Moira*. Since that date all specialists in the group had accepted the genera *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, and *Moira* Agassiz, 1872, treating *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, as the type species of *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, and *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, as the type species of *Moira* Agassiz, 1872. Dr. Mortensen and his colleagues asked that this practice should be validated under the plenary powers.

(6) *Brissus* Gray, 1825: Gray had established this genus for four nominal species. The trivial names of the first and second of these species were *ventricosus* Leske and *unicolor* Leske respectively. The species bearing the first of these names had later been transferred to the genus *Meoma* Gray, 1851. Thereafter, the species bearing the trivial name *unicolor* Leske had been treated by all authors as the type species of the genus *Brissus* Gray. Dr Mortensen asked the Commission to validate this practice under their plenary powers.

In conclusion, Dr. Mortensen had expressed the view that the six generic names covered by the present application were so inextricably connected that they could not be treated separately. He accordingly asked the Commission to use their plenary powers to validate all the generic names in question, as from the authors and dates of publication, and with the type species, indicated in the application. This application had been one of the eight applications on which, before submitting it to the Commission (in 1932), Dr. Mortensen had consulted 38 leading specialists who were working on the group in various parts of the world. Of these specialists, 35 had voted in favour of the submission to the Commission of the present application, two (Bather; Brighton) had not voted, while one only (Lambert) had voted against the course proposed.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present group of applications had been advertised but the advertisement had elicited no adverse comment.

IN DISCUSSION the view was expressed that it was evident that the strict application of the *Règles* would completely change the way in which these generic names would in future have to be used. Great disturbance in nomenclatorial practice would be involved and this would inevitably lead to widespread confusion, in view of the very extensive literature, extending far beyond the literature of systematic zoology, which had accumulated around such

names as *Spatangus* and *Echinocardium*. For these reasons and, having regard also to the strong support for these proposals expressed all but unanimously by the leading workers in this field in both Hemispheres, it was generally agreed that the objects sought by the applicants should be met by the Commission. On the other hand, some of the argument advanced in the application were not of a character which could be entertained by the Commission; in particular, it was not possible either to ignore for the purposes of Articles 25 and 34 the uses of a generic name prior to a certain date (on the ground that the earlier authors had placed discordant material in the genus concerned), or, under Article 30 to accord any right to be accepted as the type species of a genus to a given species, on the ground only that it was the first of the species to have been cited, among others, under the name of the genus by its original author. In drawing up the conclusion of the Commission on these applications, it would be necessary to pay due regard to these considerations. Again in some cases (for example, in the case of the names *Schizaster* Agassiz [1836], and *Moira* Agassiz, 1872 (as derived from the invalid homonym *Moera* Michelin, 1855), it was not clear from the application how the species there mentioned as type species of the genera concerned had come to be recognised as such, whether that process had been in accordance with the Rules specified in Article 30 and therefore whether the use of the plenary powers was necessary or not.

In further discussion it was agreed that the plenary powers should be used, where this was necessary, to secure the ends sought in the present application, but that, where it was doubtful (for any reason) whether the use of those powers was necessary to achieve the desired object, it should be expressly recorded that the plenary powers were used for that purpose only to the extent that might be necessary therefor. The Acting President, as Secretary to the Commission, was accordingly invited to examine the present application from the foregoing point of view after the close of the present Session and, in the light of that examination, to draft the Conclusion on this matter in such a way as, in his opinion, would meet fully the objects set out in the application and also the points made in the discussion as recorded above.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) to use their plenary powers:—

(a) to suppress the undermentioned generic names:—

(i) *Brissus* Müller, 1781 (Class Echinoidae)

- (ii) *Brissus* Modeer, 1793 (Class Echinoidea)
- (iii) *Brissus* Link, 1807 (Class Echinoidea)
- (iv) *Brissus* Oken, 1815 (Class Echinoidea)
- (v) *Brissus* Dahl, 1823 (emend. of *Bryssus* Dejean, 1821) (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera)
- (vi) *Bryssus* Dejean, 1821 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera)
- (vii) *Brissus*, as used by any other author prior to the publication of *Brissus* Gray, 1825
- (viii) *Echinocardium* Leske, 1778, in so far as that name was published by that author as a generic name
- (ix) *Spatangus* Leske, 1778
- (x) *Spatangus* Modeer, 1793
- (xi) *Spatangus*, as used by any other author prior to the publication of *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 ;

(b) to validate the undermentioned generic names :—

- (i) *Brissus* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea)
- (ii) *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea), in so far as this name requires to be validated by reason of the existence of the prior name *Echinocardium* Leske, 1778, suppressed, in so far as may be necessary in (a)(viii) above ;
- (iii) *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) ;

(c) to set aside all selections of type species for the undermentioned genera made prior to the present decision and to designate the species severally specified below to be the type species of the genera concerned :—

- (i) *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, to be the type species of the genus *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, as validated, in so far as may be necessary, in (b)(ii) above ;

(ii) *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz (L.), 1840, to be the type species of the genus *Schizaster* Agassiz (L.) [1836] ;

(iii) *Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor* Leske, 1778, to be the type species of the genus *Brissus* Gray, 1825, as validated in (b)(i) above ;

(iv) *Spatangus purpureus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, to be the type species of the genus *Spatangus* Gray, 1825, as validated in (b)(iii) above ;

(d) in so far as the use of the plenary powers may be necessary to secure that *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, shall be the type species of the genus *Moira* Agassiz (A.), 1872, to set aside all selections of type species made for that genus prior to the selection of the above species by Clark (H. L.), 1917 ;

(2) to place on record that the reputed generic name *Brissus* Leske, 1778 (Class Echinoidea), has no existence under the *Règles*, as interpreted in *Opinion* 183 (now, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, to be incorporated in the *Règles*), having regard to the fact that this term was published by Leske in the nominative plural (as *Brissi*) instead of in the nominative singular as required by Article 8 ;

(3) to place the names of the undermentioned genera of the Class Echinoidea (Order Spatangoida), with the type species severally specified below, on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " :—

<i>Name of genus</i>	<i>Type species of genus specified in Col. (1)</i>
----------------------	--

(1)	(2)
-----	-----

<i>Brissus</i> Gray, 1825, as validated in (1) (b) (i) above.	<i>Spatangus brissus</i> var. <i>unicolor</i> Leske, 1778 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (c) (iii) above).
---	--

<i>Echinocardium</i> Gray, 1825, as validated in (1) (b) (ii) above.	<i>Echinus cordatus</i> Pennant, 1777 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (c) (i) above).
--	--

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 12)

Moira Agassiz (A.), *Spatangus atropos*
1872. Lamarck, 1816 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (d) above).

Ova Gray, 1825 *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816 (type species by monotypy).

Schizaster Agassiz (L.) [1836]. *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz (L.), 1840 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (c) (ii) above).

Spatangus Gray, 1825, as validated in (1) (b). *Spatagus purpureus* Müller (O. F.), 1776 (type species designated under the plenary powers in (1) (c) (iv) above).

(4) to place the undermentioned generic names and reputed generic names on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" :—

- (i) the eleven generic names suppressed under the plenary powers, as specified in (1) (a) (i) to (xi) above ;
- (ii) the reputed but non-existent generic name *Brissus* Leske, 1778, rejected under (2) above ;
- (iii) *Prospatangus* Lambert, 1902 ;
- (iv) *Moera* Michelin, 1855 ;

(5) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" :—

atropos Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binominal combination *Spatangus atropos*)
canaliferus Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binominal combination *Spatangus canaliferus*)
cordatus Pennant, 1777 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinus cordatus*)
purpureus Müller (O. F.), 1776 (as published in the binominal combination *Spatagus purpureus*)
studeri Agassiz (L.), 1840 (as published in the binominal combination *Schizaster studeri*)

unicolor Leske, 1778 (as published as a sub-specific trivial name in the trinominal combination *Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor*)

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

Report by the Secretary to the Commission :

In accordance with the request of the Commission, I have re-examined the application submitted in this case for the purpose of determining how the objects set forth therein can be attained with the minimum use of the plenary powers, those powers being used only in respect of those purposes which can be achieved in no other way and being used conditionally "in so far as may be necessary" in cases where such use may be necessary to achieve the desired ends but that need is not clearly established. In the course of this re-examination, I have had the benefit of the advice of Dr. Mortensen. In addition, I have consulted a number of the books and papers cited in the present application. The conclusions which I have reached are as follows:—

(1) *Brissus* and *Spatangus*: If, as proposed, the generic names *Brissus* and *Spatangus* are to be made available in the sense in which they were respectively used by Gray in 1825, it will be necessary to use the plenary powers to suppress all prior uses of these names, and to validate these two names as from Gray, 1825. In view of the fact that Gray did not publish the names *Brissus* and *Spatangus* as new names and each, in order to acquire recognition under the *Règles*, requires the use by the Commission of their plenary powers, the same powers should be used to designate the type species of these genera. Quite apart from this consideration, the plenary powers would be necessary to ensure that the animal to which in 1778 Leske applied the trivial name *unicolor* should be the type species of this genus, for, even if that was the first of the originally included species to be selected by a later author to be the type species of this genus (which appears probable from, but is not clearly established in, the application submitted to the Commission), the type species of this genus would, under the *Règles* (Article 30, Rule (d)), be *Spatangus brissus* Leske, 1778, by absolute tautonymy, in view of the fact that the trivial name *unicolor* was published by Leske in the combination *Spatangus brissus* var. *unicolor*. If it had not been for the consideration indicated above, it would not have been necessary to use the plenary powers to designate *Spatangus purpureus* Müller (O. F.), 1776, as the type species of the genus *Spatangus* Gray, 1825, for that nominal species (attributed, however, to Leske) was the sole species then cited (430) by Gray under the generic name *Spatangus* and would accordingly have been the type species by monotypy.

(3) *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825: This name is usually treated as having been first published in 1825 by Gray (by whom it was doubtfully attributed to van Phelsum), but, as pointed out in the application, the term *Echinocardium* appears in Leske's *Additamenta* of 1778 as a translation of the Belgian expression "Egelhart" used by van Phelsum. In order, therefore, to obviate the risk of a claim later being advanced that Leske used this word as a generic name and therefore that *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825, is an invalid homonym, the conditional use of the plenary powers under the formula "in so far as the use of the plenary powers may be necessary" is desirable to suppress the name *Echinocardium* as used (and in so far as it was used) by Leske in 1778 as a generic name and to validate, in so far as necessary, the generic name *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825. As regards the type species of this genus, the plenary powers are certainly necessary to secure the acceptance of *Echinus cordatus* Pennant, 1777, for that nominal species was not cited by Gray (430) when he published the generic name *Echinocardium*.

(4) *Schizaster* Agassiz (L.) [1836]: The name *Schizaster* Agassiz is itself an available name, but the plenary powers are needed to secure that *Schizaster studeri* Agassiz should be its type species, since although that

name (binominal combination) appears in Agassiz's original description of the genus *Schizaster*, it was then only a *nomen nudum*, the trivial name in question not being published with an indication until 1840 (Agassiz, 1840, *Cat. Ect. Ech.* : 3).

(5) *Moira* Agassiz (A.), 1872 : This name (which was published as a substitute for the invalid homonym *Moera* Michelin, 1855), is an available name ; the species, *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck, 1816, which is commonly treated as its type species, is eligible for selection as such, having been one of the species included by Michelin in his genus *Moera*. Moreover, that species has certainly been selected as the type species of this genus, e.g. by Clark (H. L.) in 1917 (*Mem. Mus. comp. Zool.*, 46 : 195). It is not clear, however, either whether this was the first occasion on which this species was selected as the type species or whether any of the other originally included species had previously been so selected. In order to prevent any question being raised as to the validity of the selection of this species as the type species of this genus, it would be well, as in the case of the question of the availability of the generic name *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 (discussed in (3) above), to use the plenary powers conditionally and "to such extent as may be necessary" to set aside all selections of type species for the genus *Moira* Agassiz, 1872, made prior to the selection of *Spatangus atropos* Lamarck as such by Clark (H. L.) in 1917.

(6) *Ova* Gray, 1825 : This name, wrongly attributed by Gray (: 431) to van Phelsum, is an available name and the type species of the genus so named is *Spatangus canaliferus* Lamarck, 1816, by monotypy. The plenary powers are thus not required either to validate this name or to secure that the species accepted as the type species of this genus should in fact be its type species. This name was only included in the present application because the type species of this genus had been (erroneously) alleged by Lambert (1902) to be referable to the genus *Spatangus*, as interpreted by that author.

In the light of the foregoing conclusions, I have drafted the record of the Commission's decision in this case in the terms set forth in Conclusion 36 of the Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Paris Session, at which it was discussed, those terms giving effect to the decision of the Commission to meet the objects sought by Commissioner Mortensen in the present application and at the same time involving, as desired by the Commission, the minimum use of the plenary powers consistent with securing the objects referred to above.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretariat of the Commission,
28, Park Village East,
Regent's Park, London, N.W.1,
England.

22nd August, 1949.

"*Arachnoides*"
Leske, 1778,
" *Echinarachnius*"
Gray, 1825 (Class
Echinoidea)
validated under
the plenary powers,
and, with
" *Echinodiscus*"
Leske, 1778 (Class
Echinoidea),
placed on the
" Official List of
Generic Names in
Zoology "

37. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)322, containing an application submitted by Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to place on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" the well-known generic names *Arachnoides*, *Echinarachnius* and *Echinodiscus* (Class Echinoidea) in such a way as to secure that these names should be rendered available for use in their accustomed sense. The following is a summary of the main points made by Commissioner Mortensen in his application in regard to each of these names.

(1) *Arachnoides*: This name was commonly attributed to Klein (1734), although it possessed, as from that date,

no availability under the *Règles*, having been published by Klein prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature. The first occasion subsequent to 1757 on which it was published by a binominal author was when it was so published by Leske in 1778. Leske, however, while accepting the concept represented by Klein's genus *Arachnoides*, had changed the name to *Echinarachnius*. Leske had cited under this genus only *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, 1758. This species had been treated as the type species of *Arachnoides* by every subsequent author and had been definitely selected as such by Agassiz (L.) in 1841. The name *Arachnoides* had continued to be used in this sense by virtually all workers in the group until in 1914 Lambert and Thiéry had rejected the name *Arachnoides* of Klein and Leske in favour of *Echinarachnius* Leske, 1778, on the ground that the name *Arachnoides* had been used in a different sense by Linck in 1733 and therefore that this name, as used by Klein in 1734, was invalid, his *Arachnoides* being a junior homonym of *Arachnoides* Linck, 1732. The acceptance of the contention advanced by Lambert and Thiéry, involving the transfer of the name *Echinarachnius* from its well-known sense (see (2) below) to the genus universally known by the name *Arachnoides*, would lead to great confusion. Although other specialists in the group had not accepted the views of Lambert and Thiéry, Dr. Mortensen had thought it desirable, in order to avoid any danger of the great confusion which would follow such an acceptance, to ask the Commission to use their plenary powers to place the generic name *Arachnoides* Klein on the "Official List of Generic Names" with *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus as type species.

(2) *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825: This genus had been characterised by Gray who had placed in it *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus (the species similarly placed therein by Leske in 1778 when he first published this generic name) and *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816. The latter species had been selected as the type species of *Echinarachnius* by Agassiz (L.) in 1841 on the same occasion as that on which (as shown above) he had selected *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus to be the type species of the genus *Arachnoides*. This genus, with the above species as type species, had been unanimously accepted by all subsequent workers until in 1914 Lambert and Thiéry (in the paper referred to in (1) above) had revived the name *Echinarachnius* Leske, 1778, for *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, thus making the name *Echinarachnius* as used by Gray in 1825 an invalid homonym. It was part of Dr. Mortensen's proposal that, in order to avoid the confusion

which would otherwise be inevitable, the name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825 (type species: *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816) should be validated by the Commission at the same time as they similarly validated the name *Arachnoides* Klein.

(3) *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778: This genus was established by Leske for a large number of species, of which *Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778, came to be regarded by all workers as the type species and was ultimately selected as such by Clark (H. L.) in 1911. Except for a short period when some authors referred the above species to the genus *Lobophora* Agassiz (L.), 1841 (a name which had to be rejected when it was found to be a homonym), all specialists in this group had accepted the genus *Echinodiscus* Leske (with the above species as type species) until in 1883 Pomel had advanced the claim that this name should be used as the generic name for *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, on the ground that it had been used for that species (among other discordant material) by Breynius in 1732, that author's use of the name *Echinodiscus* thus antedating by one year the use by Klein (1734) of the name *Arachnoides* for the species referred to above. The admission of this contention which would involve the acceptance as from their original date of publication of names published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature (i.e. before 1758) would render the generic name *Echinodiscus* Leske an invalid homonym of the genus *Echinodiscus* Breynius. Although other specialists had not accepted the contention of Pomel, Commissioner Mortensen thought it desirable to ask the Commission to settle the matter once and for all by using their plenary powers to place *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778 (type species: *Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," at the same time that they disposed of the contention advanced by Lambert and Thiéry (also based on the action of an author prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature) by validating the generic name *Arachnoides* in its well understood and generally accepted sense.

Summing up, Commissioner Mortensen had said that great confusion would arise in the nomenclature of three of the most widely known genera in the Class Echinoidea if the views advanced, in the case of the names *Arachnoides* and *Echinarachnius*, by Lambert and Thiéry and, in the case of the above names and also the name *Echinodiscus*, by Pomel were to gain currency. To prevent this from happening, he (Commissioner Mortensen) asked the Commission to use their plenary powers in the manner proposed.

IN THE DISCUSSION which ensued it was generally agreed that a case had been established regarding the likelihood of confusion arising in the event of current nomenclatorial practice in regard to the generic names *Arachnoides*, *Echinarachnium* and *Echinodiscus* being disturbed in the manner which would be inevitable if either the contention advanced by Lambert and Thiéry (1914) or that advanced by Pomel (1883) were to be accepted. The plenary powers should, it was agreed, be used to such extent as might be necessary to prevent this from happening. On the other hand, care would need to be taken to restrict the use of the plenary powers to those portions of the application (for example, the validation of the name *Echinarachnium* Gray, 1825, as against the earlier identical generic name *Echinarachnium* Leske, 1778), which could only be granted after the use of those powers. Those powers should not be used in respect of those portions of the application which dealt with difficulties arising from erroneous interpretations of the *Règles*, such as those arising from the action of Pomel (1883) and Lambert and Thiéry (1914) in claiming for names originally published before 1758 (i.e. before the starting point of zoological nomenclature as prescribed in Article 26) either (a) rights of priority prior to the date on which, subsequent to 1757, they had been given availability through being reinforced (by adoption or acceptance) by the same or another author or (b) the power, before being so reinforced, of influencing the availability of the same name as published by a binominal author subsequent to 1757.

At the conclusion of this discussion the Acting President, as Secretary to the Commission, was invited in this case (as in that of *Spatangus* referred to above) to examine the application from the foregoing point of view after the close of the present Session and, in the light of that examination, to draft the Conclusion on this matter in such a way as, in his opinion, would meet fully the objects set out in the application and also the points made in the discussion as recorded above.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 24)

(1) that, having regard to the interpretation of Article 25 given in *Opinion 5* (the relevant provisions of which were now, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, to be incorporated in the *Règles*) :—

(a) the name *Arachnoides* Klein, 1734 (a name published prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature, as prescribed in

Article 26) acquired no rights under the Law of Priority in virtue of Klein's work in which it originally appeared being re-published in 1778, since this was merely a re-issue of the 1734 work, or in virtue of having been published in Leske's *Additamenta* (1778) to the foregoing work, since on that occasion Leske not only did not reinforce the name by adoption or acceptance (as prescribed by *Opinion 5*) but actually rejected it, publishing a new name, *Echinarachnius*, as a substitute for it;

(b) the name *Echinodiscus* Breynius, 1732 (a name published prior to the starting-point of zoological nomenclature), not having been given availability under the *Règles* by being re-inforced (through adoption or acceptance) prior to the publication of the name *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778, possessed no status in zoological nomenclature as at that date and accordingly (contrary to the view erroneously expressed by Pomel in 1883) the name *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778, is not to be rejected under Article 34 as an invalid homonym;

(2) to use their plenary powers:—

(a) to validate as from Leske, 1778, the generic name *Arachnoides* and to designate *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of that genus;

(b) to suppress the generic name *Echinarachnius* Leske, 1778, and all uses of that name prior to the publication of the name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825;

(c) to validate the generic name *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825, and to designate *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816, to be the type species of that genus;

(3) to place the undermentioned generic names on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":—

Arachnoides Leske, 1778, validated as in (2)(a) above (type species, by designation under the plenary powers, as specified in (2)(a) above: *Echinus placenta* Linnaeus, 1758)

Echinarachnius Gray, 1825, validated as in (2)(c) above (type species, by designation under

the plenary powers, as specified in (2)(c) above : *Scutella parma* Lamarck, 1816 ;

Echinodiscus Leske, 1778 (type species, by selection by Clark (H. L.), 1911 : *Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778) ;

(4) to place the undermentioned generic names on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" :—

Arachnoides Klein, 1778 (a reputed name rejected in (1)(a) above)

Echinarachnius Leske, 1778

Echinarachnius as used by any author subsequent to Leske, 1778, and prior to Gray, 1825

Lobophora Agassiz (L.), 1841 ;

(5) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" :—

bisperforatus Leske, 1778 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinodiscus bisperforatus*)

parma Lamarck, 1816 (as published in the binominal combination *Scutella parma*)

placenta Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echinus placenta*) ;

(6) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

Report by the Secretary to the Commission :

In accordance with the request of the Commission, I have re-examined the application submitted in this case for the purpose of determining how the objects set forth therein can be attained with the minimum use of the plenary powers. In the course of this re-examination I have had the benefit of the advice of Dr. Mortensen. In addition, I have consulted a number of the books and papers cited in the present application. The conclusions which I have reached are as follows :—

(1) *Arachnoides*: The plenary powers are certainly needed to validate this name as from 1778, the first date subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature (1758), on which this name was published, for, as then published by Leske, it was a name taken from a pre-1758 author (Klein) which Leske not only did not re-inforce by adoption or acceptance (the conditions laid down in *Opinion 5* as the sole means by which such a name can be given status under the *Règles*), but which he actually rejected in favour of a new name (*Echinarachnius*) proposed by himself. This being so, the plenary powers will be needed also to designate a type species for this genus.

(2) *Echinarachnius* Gray, 1825 : Gray (: 428) did not look upon himself as publishing *Echinarachnius* as a new name, for he correctly referred this name to Leske, by whom (as shown in (1) above) it had been published in 1788. In order to be able validly to treat *Echinarachnius* as an available name first published by Gray in 1825, it will thus be necessary to use the plenary powers to suppress the name *Echinarachnius*

Leske, 1788, and all subsequent uses of that name prior to Gray, 1825, to validate the name *Echinorachnius* Gray, 1825, and to designate a type species for the genus so named.

(3) *Echinodiscus* Leske, 1778 : This is an available name, the objection raised against it by Pomel (1883) being totally groundless, being based upon a misconceived belief that a use put to a generic name by an author (Breyneus) at a date (1732) prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature (1758) can affect the status of the same name as published after 1758. There is therefore no need for the plenary powers to be used to validate this name. Nor is there any need for those powers to be used to designate a type species for this genus, for the species (*Echinodiscus bisperforatus* Leske, 1778) which it is desired should be recognised as such was in fact so selected by Clark (H. L.) in 1911.

In the light of the foregoing conclusions, I have drafted the record of the Commission's decision in this case in the terms set forth in Conclusion 37 of the Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Paris Session, at which it was discussed, those terms giving effect to the decision of the Commission to meet the objects sought by Commissioner Mortensen in the present application and at the same time involving, as desired by the Commission, the minimum use of the plenary powers consistent with securing the objects referred to above.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretariat of the Commission,
28, Park Village East,
Regent's Park, London, N.W.1,
England.

23rd August, 1949.

"Echeneis"
Linnaeus, 1758
(Class Pisces,
Order
Discocephali),
designation of type
species of,
under the plenary
powers, the
position of
"Echeneis"
Linnaeus on the
"Official List"
confirmed, and
"Remora" Gill,
1862 (Class Pisces,
Order
Discocephali)
added thereto

38. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)156, containing an application submitted by Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) as Secretary to the Commission that the Commission should use their plenary powers to designate *Echeneis naucrates* (an emendation of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (thereby giving valid force to the erroneous entry in regard to this generic name made in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" under a decision recorded in *Opinion 92*), and at the same time to place on the "Official List" the generic name *Remora* Gill, 1862 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali), with *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, when in 1944 he had been engaged in preparing the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" for publication in book form and in consequence had had occasion to examine in detail the entries made in that "List" under the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, he had noted, when examining *Opinion 92*, that under that *Opinion* the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, had been placed on the "Official List" with *Echeneis neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species, notwithstanding the fact (1) that among the synonyms cited by Linnaeus for *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758 (the other species placed by him in the genus *Echeneis* at the time when he first

published that generic name) was the pre-1758 universal specific name "Echeneis", and therefore (2) that, under the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 given in the Commission's *Opinion* 16, *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonomy. It was immediately evident that it was necessary for the Commission either to correct the entry in the "Official List" in regard to this generic name or to validate that entry by the use of the plenary powers. It had appeared to him that the latter would be the more appropriate course, having regard to the fact (a) that the erroneous entry in *Opinion* 92 corresponded with the generally current practice of ichthyologists, and (b) that the strict application of the *Règles* would involve the confusing transfer of the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, to the species now always placed in the genus *Remora* Gill, 1862, and the sinking of the latter name in synonymy. He had accordingly consulted Dr. C. M. Breder, Jr. (American Museum of Natural History, New York), Dr. Leonard P. Schultz (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.) and Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (British Museum (Natural History), London), all of whom were in favour of the action now proposed. Dr. Schultz had added that Dr. Samuel F. Hildebrand and Dr. Robert R. Miller, both actively engaged on systematic work on ichthyology in the U.S. National Museum, concurred in the views which had been submitted in this case. It was evident therefore that there was massive support for the present application. In 1947, it had been published as Note 6 of the "Editorial Notes" attached to the reissue of *Opinion* 16, in view of the fact that in that *Opinion* the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus had actually been cited with its true type species *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758 (Hemming, 1947, in *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*, 1: 287-297). No adverse comment on the action proposed had been received in consequence of the application being so published, nor had any such comment been elicited when later an advertisement of this application had been published in *Science* and *Nature*.

The Acting President added, with reference to the proposal that the name *Remora* Gill, 1862, should now be placed on the "Official List," that (as would be seen from the text of the application published in 1947), it was necessary first to clear up the question where, and by whom, the generic name *Remora* had been first published, in view of the fact that in the latest *Nomenclator* (Neave, 1940, *Nomenc. Zool.*, 4: 21) references were given to two generic

names *Remora*, each alleged to have been published prior to *Remora* Gill, 1862. The works in which these reputed generic names (*Remora* Gouan, 1770, and *Remora* Forster, 1771) had been published had been kindly examined by Dr. Leonard P. Schultz, whose conclusions were contained in a letter included in File Z.N.(S.) 156 which had been published in the present application (Schultz, 1947, *in Hemming, loc. cit.*, 1 : 293). It was clear from the particulars so furnished by Dr. Schultz that neither Gouan (1770) nor Forster (1771) had published the word " *Remora* " as a generic name and that this name had not been so published by any other author previous to Gill, 1862. In these circumstances the way was clear for putting the name *Remora* Gill, 1862, on the " Official List " without resorting in this matter even to a conditional use of the plenary powers (as he had originally suggested). It would, however, be necessary for the Commission to put on record that there were no such generic names as those attributed to Gouan and Forster. As regards the trivial name of the species proposed to be designated as the type species of the genus *Echeneis*, the spelling " *neucrates* " was an evident error of orthography (" *faute d'orthographe* ") and as such had been universally emended by specialists to " *naucrates* ." This emendation had been accepted by the Commission itself, when in *Opinion* 92, they had placed the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus on the " Official List." It would be well to take the present opportunity to place on record that under Article 19 this was the correct spelling for this name.

IT WAS GENERALLY AGREED that in view of the confusion which would result from the strict application of the *Règles* in the present case, the desirability of avoiding (wherever possible) the making of changes in entries previously made in the " Official List," the wide and representative support for the present proposals received from leading ichthyologists and the complete lack of opposition of any kind, a case for the use of the plenary powers in the present instance had been established and that the application should be granted.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to use their plenary powers to set aside the original indication of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali) by absolute tautonymy (Article 30, Rule (d), as interpreted by *Opinion* 16) and in the place of that species to designate *Echeneis neucrates*

Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus ;

(2) that neither Gouan (1770) nor Forster (1771) when using the word "Remora," had used it as a generic name and therefore that the reputed generic names *Remora* Gouan, 1770, and *Remora* Forster, 1771, were to be rejected as having no existence under the *Règles*;

(3) to confirm explicitly the decision given implicitly in *Opinion* 92 (when the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, had been placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology") that a "faute d'orthographe" was evident in the spelling of the trivial name *neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis neucrates*) and therefore that the spelling of that trivial name is, under Article 19, to be emended to *naucrates*;

(4) to confirm the position on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" of the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers under (1) above : *Echeneis naucrates* (emend. of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758) (decision confirming action taken in *Opinion* 92) ;

(5) to place the generic name *Remora* Gill, 1862 (type species, by absolute tautonomy : *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" ;

(6) to place the undermentioned reputed but non-existent generic names, rejected under (2) above, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology" :—

- (i) *Remora* Gouan, 1770 ;
- (ii) *Remora* Forster, 1771 ;

(7) to place the undermentioned trivial names on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" :—

naucrates Linnaeus, 1758 (emendation, under (3) above, of *neucrates*, as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis neucrates*)

remora Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis remora*) ;

(8) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (7) above.

“*Papilio iris*”
Linnaeus, 1758
(Class Insecta,
Order Lepidoptera):
identity of,
determined under
the plenary powers

39. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)184, containing an application submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to determine the identity of the species to which the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*) should adhere and the locality to be accepted as the type locality of the species so named. Ever since it had been published, this trivial name had been applied to the Nymphaline butterfly of the genus *Apatura* Fabricius, 1807, which occurred in England and was there known as the “Purple Emperor.” A recent examination of the butterflies in the Linnean collection, now in the possession of the Linnean Society of London, had convinced the late Dr. Corbet and Mr. W. H. T. Tams (British Museum (Natural History), London) that there was no evidence to support the allegations that had sometimes been made that Sir James Smith had altered labels on specimens in the Linnean collection; in consequence, both these specialists were of the opinion that the labels on these specimens could be relied upon and that by this and other evidence (e.g. the type of pin used, the style of setting employed) it was possible to identify the “types” of the majority of the species described by Linnaeus. In the case of the species now under consideration, Dr. Corbet had concluded that without doubt Linnaeus had based his description of *Papilio iris* not upon the “Purple Emperor” of England, but on the closely allied (and very similar) species which was widely distributed in Continental Europe (but did not extend to England), to which in 1775 Schiffermüller and Denis had given the trivial name *ilia* (in the combination *Papilio ilia*), the name by which the species in question had ever since been known. Dr. Corbet’s conclusion, which was based in the first instance on his examination of the Linnean collection, had been confirmed by a manuscript note by Linnaeus in his own copy of the 10th Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, which could apply only to the species now universally known by the trivial name *ilia* [Schiffermüller and Denis]. Nevertheless, the description of *iris* Linnaeus must have been based, at least in part, on descriptions of the “Purple Emperor” of England, for otherwise he could not have written (as he did) that this species occurred in “Anglia.” The greatest confusion would occur if it were necessary to transfer the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758, from the Apaturid which occurred in England and on the continent of Europe to the allied species which occurred in Continental Europe but not in England. This was a case where, owing to uncertainty regarding the manner in which the *Règles*

should be applied, there would be a perpetual risk of confusion until the Commission gave a ruling under their plenary powers as to which of the two species in question was the species to which the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus should be applied. Dr. Corbet had accordingly proposed that the Commission should use those powers to direct that this trivial name should be applied to the species to which it had always been applied and that of the two localities ("Germania" and "Anglia") cited by Linnaeus in 1758 "Anglia" should be accepted as the type locality.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that it was difficult to imagine a case where the transfer of a trivial name from one species to another would cause more certain or more serious confusion than in the present case. Every lepidopterist who was concerned with this group would be in agreement with the present proposal. The application had been advertised but no objection had been received from any source to the action proposed. It would be necessary in this case, as in other similar cases (for example, the case dealing with the identity of the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal combination *Papilio plexippus*, which the Commission had considered at the meeting noted in the margin), to specify a good figure of an undoubted specimen of the species (the "Purple Emperor" of England) as the figure to be used in determining the identity of the species to which the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758, should apply. He suggested that for this purpose the figure of the ♂ given in fig. 1 on pl. 29 of South's "The Butterflies of the British Isles" should be selected for this purpose, the figure in question being a good one and the work in which it was published being inexpensive and widely known. The Acting President added that, when a decision had been taken on the present application, the difficulty in regard to the identity of the type species of the genus *Apatura* Fabricius, 1807, to which he had referred when earlier in the present meeting the Commission had been considering an application for the suppression under the plenary powers of the possibly earlier name *Apatura* [Illiger], 1807, would have been satisfactorily overcome.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
13th Meeting,
Conclusion 7)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
14th Meeting,
Conclusion 16)

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that he had no doubt that the application submitted by the late Dr. Corbet should be granted. Any other course would inevitably lead to the most serious confusion.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to use their plenary powers to direct that the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio iris*) should be applied to the species figured as *Apatura iris* by South (R.), 1906, *The Butterflies of the British Isles* as figure 1 on plate 29 and that the type locality of this species, i.e. the type locality of the nominotypical subspecies of this species, should be deemed to be "England" ("Anglia" of Linnaeus, 1758);
- (2) that the foregoing definition of the meaning to be applied to the trivial name *iris* Linnaeus, 1758, should be entered against that trivial name, when, in accordance with the decision recorded in Conclusion 16(6) of the present meeting that name was inscribed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";
- (3) to place the trivial name *ilia* [Schiffermüller and Denis], 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ilia*) on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";
- (4) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

The trivial names
"ascanius"
Linnaeus, 1768 (as
published in the
binominal
combination
"Papilio
ascanius") and
"aristolochiae"
Pallas (as
published in the
binominal
combination
"Papilio
aristolochiae"), in
so far as published
prior to 1780,
suppressed, and the
trivial names
"aristolochiae"
Fabricius, 1775 (as
published in the
binominal
combination
"Papilio
aristolochiae")
and "ascanius"
Cramer, [1775]
(as published in the
binominal

40. THE COMMISSION examined Commission File Z.N.(S.)186, containing an application submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London) that the Commission should use their plenary powers: (1) to suppress the trivial names *ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) and *aristolochiae* Pallas [? 1775 or prior] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*), and (2) to validate the trivial names *aristolochiae* Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio aristolochiae*) and *ascanius* Cramer [1775] (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio ascanius*) (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). Dr. Corbet had explained that the specific name *Papilio ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768 (which was based upon a Papilionid butterfly taken by Sparrman in Java) had been a *nomen dubium*, until in 1941 he had himself identified the insect so named as a form (form *diphilus* Esper [1793]) of the species to which in 1775 Fabricius had given the specific name *Papilio aristolochiae*. If, therefore, the *Règles* were to be strictly applied in the present case, the totally unknown trivial name *ascanius* Linnaeus, 1768, would replace the

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5:—

Volume 1: A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2: This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3: This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4: This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948*. Twenty-one Parts have been published and this volume is now complete except for the index which will be published in a concluding Part.

Volume 5: At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948*, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses:—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature: 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.